SALMASIUS

His Diſſection and Confutation of the Diabolical Rebel

MILTON,

IN HIS

Impious Doctrines of Falſhood, Maxims of Policies, and deſtructive Principles of Hypocriſie, Inſolences, Invectives, Injuſtice, Cruelties, and Calumnies againſt his Gracious Soveraign

KING CHARLES I.

Made legible for the ſatisfaction of all Loyal and Obedient Subjects: But by reaſon of the rigid Inquiſition after Perſons and Preſſes by the late mercileſs Tyrant *Oliver Cromwel*, durſt not be ſold publickly in this Kingdom, under pain of Impriſonment, and other intollerable Dammages.

Regi qui perfidus, nulli fidus.

London, Printed for *F. G. B.* Anno 1660. and are to be ſold in *Weſtminſter*-Hall, St. *Pauls* Church-yard, and the Royal Exchange.

SALMASIUS

To the Sacred Majesty of

KING CHARLS II.

King of *England, Scotland, France,* and *Ireland.*

Most Gracious Soveraign,

WHilest *Artaxerxes* the mighty Monarch was marching thorow the Fields, one *Syneta* a poor Countrey man ran for a handful of water, with which he presented this Great Prince: Even such, is this, my *Munus Levidense*, for which most humbly I beg Your Majesties Pardon and Reception. The famous Author hereof could not undoubtedly be unknown to Your Majesty beyond Sea; whose learned VVritings against Sedition and Rebellion (such was the rigid Inquisition after

Perſons and Printing-preſſes) were evermore deemed malignant and unſufferable, inſomuch that to ſell one of his Books was a Crime almoſt unpardonable; or to read one, a ſufficient proof for Sequeſtration: For the Authors prophane Antagoniſt (*John Milton*, one of your Majeſties grand enemies) I ſhall leave him under the rod of correction, wherewith God hath evidenced his particular judgment by ſtriking him with blindneſs, and the Writings of the learned Author to ſolid and rational underſtandings to cenſure, ſubſcribing (with your Majeſties leave) my ſelf (as I ever have teſtified by writing) one of the humbleſt of

Your Majeſties Votaries and Vaſſals,

John Garfeild, *Bibliopola.*

The INTRODUCTION.

When the booke called Icon-baſilice was comming foorth the Rebells guilt Suggeſted Suſpitions to them of danger from the memory of his late Majeſt: as formerly they apprehended from his life, ſtriving, that he might not appeare to poſteritie out of thoſe ignominious Circumſtances, which they had contrived in the murther of him, and thence their rigid Inquiſition after perſons and Preſſes. Rebells riſe by flattery, rule by force, and they, that made ſo many appeales to the people, forbid them now to know the groanes of a dead Martyr. Vpon the comming foorth of the booke, they found what they feared, that many, whoſe paſſion kept them from a right judgment in the heate of Action, ſaw their owne errours in that booke, and that the perſon, and cauſe of his late Majeſt: began to be more Generally vnderſtood, and being not able to ſtrangle it in the birth, they ſought how to caſt itt foorth to be deſtroyed, rayſinge rumours, that it was not the worke of his late Majeſt: thinkeing to make men leſſe intent on the booke, if the author were ſuſpected, and that they might thereby take of all opinion of pietie, and wiſedome from his late Majeſt: which might be collected from his writings, it being the Cuſtome of Rebells to prevaile more by Calumnies vpon the diſpoſition, then the Actions of Princes. They ſeeke to improve crueltie above nature for having by wicked hands deſtroyed the Lords anointed, they would deface the Memory of their owne vile Actions againſt him, hy-

ring falſe Prophetts to curſe him, & they grudge at his Crowne in heaven, as they uſurped that on earth. Its no new thing for perſons of moſt eminent vertue to fall into the obloquy, & ſuffer by the rage of the miſled people, and therefore no wonder if innocence finde an orutour to accuſe it, & Treaſon an Advocate, to defend it. Rebellion never wanted a Trumpet & though the contrivance of it be in Caves, & vaults, yet ſucceſſe makes it outface the light. His Majeſt: booke hath paſſed the cenſure of the greateſt part of the learned world, being tranſlated into the moſt ſpred Languages, and ſtrangers honour his Memory, and abhorre his murtherers, but ſuch, as regarde not the al ſeeing eye of God beholding their wickednes, deſpiſe the judgment of the whole world, and there is a man found out, that will breake downe the united reaſon of mankinde, & he tells men, they muſt take his word above their owne, and all mens reaſon, this he vndertakes, that lookes on kings, as Ants, and the kings booke, as wanting all moment of Soliditie, and if, as he choſe the Title of Iconoclaſtes he had written his booke in a Forraigne, or learned language, his vnfaithfullnes, and impudence would be as open, and odious as his vanitie is ridiculous.

And though the exceptions againſt his Majeſt: booke fall away of them ſelves, and Traytours Apologies carry with them their owne Confutation, yet indignation at the ſhameleſſe inſolence, and vntruth of Iconoclaſtes provokes a juſt vindication of his late Majeſt: from the lewde ſlanders of the anſwearer. A Dumbe childe gott ſpeech at the apprehenſion of an Injury to the father, and its a dead Loyaltie, that ſtands vnmoved at the curſing of a ſhimei, and thoſe curſes of ſhimei recorded in Scripture were leſſe virulent, and more excuſable, then this Authors language of his late Majeſt: through his whole Treatiſe, which is a Treaſon againſt God, and Man, Religion, Truth, and Iuſtice.

THE

THE

Preface Examined.

HIS Firſt words are. *To deſcant on the misfortunes of a perſon fallen from ſo high a dignitie, who hath alſo paid his finall debt to nature, and his faults, is neither of it ſelfe a thing commendable, nor the intention of this Diſcourſe.*

That it is not a thing commendable is a greed by all, and that it is the intention of this Authors Diſcourſe all men diſcerne by this very expreſſion, and in every Period he inſolently, and ſcorne fully ſpeakes of the perſon of his late Majeſt: as fallen into that misfortune, and his whole booke is a continued Confutation of this falſe aſſertion. baſe natures delight in the misfortunes of perſons in higheſt place: It is hatefull in any to deſcant on the misfortunes, of Princes, but in ſuch, as have relation vnto them by ſervice, or Subiection as this libeller to the late king is the Compendium of all vnworthynes, and vnnaturall inſolence. Could he ſay *his Majeſt: had paid his debt to his faults without deſcant on his misfortunes?* But he giues timely warning, what is to be expected in his booke,

where like a shameles theife taken in the fact he denies what he openly acts.

He saies it is not to get a name, for no man ever got honour by writing against a King, being strong in Legions, weake in Arguments.

Some men have desired a name for Brutish arrogance against Princes, and that may be the Authors ambition, but however it have fared with others, that have spitt their venom in the faces of Kings, its certaine he hath lighted vpon the prediction of his owne succesſe, for he will gaine only in famy by this vndertaking. Never man found honour by raking in the ashes of dead Princes, but vnnatural crueltie seekes to Surfeit vpon the grave. This Author doth not only digg vp the bones of the dead King, but seekes to bring Destruction on al Kings, and bury them in the ruines of their Authoritie. depraved natures account the greateſt wickednes the greateſt glory, & more honour to subvert humane Societie, then destroy a Single person.

The first step, where by he mounts to Triumph over his sacred Majest: is for that he was a King, and that is vrged as proofe Sufficient, that he was *weake at Arguments, Kings* (he saies) *being accustomed from the Cradle to vse their will only, as their right hand, their Reason alwayes, as their left.*

Soe desperate is the wickednes of these men, that must vilifie the Ordinances of God for their defence. Had they matter of just exceptiō to his late Majest: they needed not, they would not draw matter of Reproach from his Office, and had they any feare of God, or reverence to man, they would not thus Lewdly traduce this greate Institution of God for the governing of mankinde the Kingly Office. God him selfe saies *the Kings heart is in the hand*

hand of the Lord, and he turneth it as Rivers of water. That a wiſe Sentence is in the heart of the King, and yet this man pretends to expect beleife in his Calumnies vpon the late King, when hee affirmes the kingly Office to bee a cauſe of weakenes of judgment, and inſufficiencie, turning all the promiſes of God in Scripture for aſſiſtance of Kings with his ſpiritt to meere Compliment, and wretchedly belying the many Monarchs of the world, that have beene as farr above others in Wiſedome, as they have beene in power.

Wee have lived to ſee that ſore evill, which the Scripture by the pen of a King, and the wiſeſt of men complained of, *to ſee Princes on foote, & Servants on horſebacke*, when the Licentious inſolence of the meaneſt tramples vpon the Soveraigntie of the higheſt, and the baſeſt of the people revile their King.

He ſaies *for their ſakes, that have not more Seriouſly conſidered Kings, then in the gawdy name of Majeſtie, and admired them, & their doings, as if they breathed not the ſame breath with other men he will (for it ſeemes,* he ſaies, *a Challenge both of him, and his partie) take vp the gantlet (though a Kings) in the behalfe of libertie, and the common wealth.*

Loyaltie hath no friends, that ſo admire Princes, as if they breathed not common breath of nature, they wel know who hath ſaid of Kings, *I have ſaid you are Gods* & the guilt of their ſin, that diſobey, or revile thē, yet non are ignorant, that *their breath is in their noſthrils, & that they ſhall dye, as others.* They, that are beſt inſtructed, & moſt conſiderate give moſt reverence to Kings. They vnderſtand, that Princes have greater promiſes of wiſedome frō God, & greater meanes to attaine it then others, & that by obeying them humane ſocietie is maintained, though they

they breath the ſame breath with them. When Saul was made King of Iſrael, there were wicked men, that ſaid, *how ſhall this man ſave us*, contemning his Authoritie, becauſe he was taken from among them ſelves, & in our dayes there is a Confluence of all the Rebellious inclinations, that troubled the world, pride of baſe people, and diſdaine of all Authoritie. Becauſe Kings are men, muſt they not therefore Rule? Muſt Gods vicegerents be deſpyſed, becauſe they are men? And becauſe we know Kings to be men, muſt wee beleive, that ſeditious ſlanderers are more then men, which are carryed, as naturall brute Beaſts? The Archangell diſputing with the Devill durſt not bring againſt him a rayling accuſation, and ſuch, as take vp Rayling accuſations againſt Princes partake of the wickednes of the evill, and hate the holynes of the bleſſed Angell. When the woman told David, he was as an Angell of God, did shee thinke he breathed not the ſame breath with others? This Author by pretending to rectifie an errour, that never was of admiring Kings, as if they breathed not the common breath of men would perſwade men to ſcorne, & deſpiſe kings, and Rebell againſt the king of kings God himſelfe, who wilbe called king, and to ſtyle that Title *a gaudy name* expreſſeth rather a ſcoffing Atheiſt, then a profeſt Chriſtian. Ambitious Rebells, that ſow the ſeedes of diſaffection to their king among the people, begin with a plauſible trueth, that kings are men, that they may erre, that they may be wicked, thence they come to application of particular Actions of their king, repreſented as deceitefully, as falshood can frame to the vnwary hearers, & becauſe it may be ſo, therefore in their logicke it muſt be ſo, and experience it ſelfe hath made apparent,

rent, how few, or none admire Kings, as if they breathed not the common breath of men, and how many forgett their dutie to them, that in Scripture are called Gods. the prevalence of corrupt nature is ſo farr above reaſon, that men are ſooner infatuated by the plauſible diſcourſes of ambitious aſpirers to beleive abſurdities making way for Rebellion, then mistaken of the nature of Kings by their ſacred Title, or dignitie, for wee have ſeene men ſeduced to beleive they might make warr againſt the King, ſo as they ſaid it was aganiſt his evill Councellours, and for King, and Parliament, that becauſe the two houſes ſate by the Kings authoritie, therefore him ſelfe had none. That they made warr in their owne defence againſt the King, and yet ſaid they fought for King, and Parlament, and contrary to the knowledge of the whole world traduced his Majeſt: Government, which was the time, if ever, when his three Kingdomes attained the height of honour, ſtrength, and wealth above their neighbours. As the Arts of thoſe ſeedes-men of ſathan were inſpired by their Maſter to the ruine of mankinde: ſo how farr they have effected it in his Majeſt: three kingdomes by this logicke of the Devill all men are wittneſſes. All boundaries of right, and wrong broken downe, and any wickednes acted by authoritie, that ſerves to ſecure the Tyranicall power, & will of the Rebell Maſters. What flouds of Chriſtian blood, what ſtarving, & pininge to death of poore Captives have our dayes been wittnes of in England? what impudent pretences of juſtice for publique Murthers, ſcenes of Iudicature, and theaters of ſlaughter? honour, and vertue proſtituted to the Common Executioner, ſo as the miſeries of former times were but an Epitome of thoſe numerous

evills, that have been brought vpon his Majeſt: Dominions in theſe few yeares, & the facts would ſeeme incredible in after ages, did not ſuch, as this Author undauntedly boaſt of the inſolencies they have committed, no hiſtorie yeilding on example of the like, whether we reguard the impudence, crueltie, inſolence, and hipocriſie of the contrivers, deceite impoſture & profannes of preachers, or credulitie, and precipitation, of the vulgar.

The author might have done well to ſhew, why his Majeſt: booke ſeemed a Challenge, it provokes no anſweare, nor handles any thing by way of controverſie but his very devotions, and inſtructions to his ſon ſeeme a Challenge, Evidence of worth in the ſufferer torments the perſecutour, and they cannot reſt, while the vertues live, though the bodies are laid in the duſt by their wicked hands.

But he wil take vp the gantlet (that no man threw downe) *though a Kings.* He lately ſaid *Kings were puny Antagomiſts, and no honour to begotten by writing againſt them* and now he will take vp the gantlet, though a Kings, it ſeemes he reckons it a condescention to ſtoope to take vp a Kings gantlet, thoſe todes, that thus ſwell wil breake with their owne venom.

This Authors pen ſhewes what libertie he loves, to endure, no juſtice towards the living, or Charitie to the dead, and to breake thoſe fetters of modeſtie, and truth, wherein a Chriſtians libertie conſiſts. Thoſe peſts of Government allwayes talke of libertie, but its only a licence to exerciſe their own inperious Tyrany over the people, and when fire breakes out of the bramble to conſume the Cedars, nothing can be expected, but inſolence, and crueltie wee have ſeene the libertie vnder the Rebells

bells in England, which is to rayle, and Rebell againſt the King, and deſtroy ſuch, as are loyall.

He ſaies *its the drift of a factious, and defeated partie to make the ſame advantage of his booke, as before of his name, & authoritie and intend not ſo much the defence of his former Actions, as promoting future deſignes.*

Thoſe, whome he calls a *defeated partie* in ſo great contempt are never the neerer a faction for the ſucceſſe, that confeſſed Rebells have gained over them. Though Armyes have been defeated, a good cauſe can never, and though he would have his Trayterous faction beleive them, that followed the king a defeated partie yet it ſeemes by his jealoſie him ſelfe doth not. Tyrants cannot ſleepe, while lawfull heires ſurvive, and the guilt of their conſciences, and vſurped power make their Enemies as terrible after they have loſt Armyes, as before. When Rebells prevaile they declaime againſt Treaſon, and in contempt of God, and their conſciences reproach ſuch with their Crymes, that moſt oppoſe them in their firſt Actions, they made vſe of the *Kings name, and authoritie*, their declarations cannot be retracted, wherein they profeſt to be for *King and Parliament*, that they fought not againſt the king, but his evil councell. The Cryme of fighting againſt the king, was a Treaſon ſo knowne, that ſhame, as well, as feare would have leſſened their partie, had they not made vſe of the kings name, & pretended his authoritie, and vnles they thinke, that their aſſertions of apparent vntruths will have the ſame power over the reaſons of men, as their Armes have gotten ove' their perſons they would not patch vp diſcourſes wit' ſuch incongruities, objecting, that the kings partie vſ his name, and authoritie, which vndoudtedly they h'

and which thoſe men profeſſe to deſtroy, and which had been vſeles tō any, had it not been the acknowledged power of the kingdome, and a confeſſed Cryme to oppoſe it, and which thoſe Traytours would never have pretended, had not the evidence of its right been ſo apparent, nor have deſtroyed after ſo much vſe of it, had they not exceeded all former Traytours, as farr, as he did his Predeceſſours, of whom the ſpirit of God ſaies, *there was none like him, that ſold himſelfe to worke wickednes.* Its the drift of the Rebell partie to confirme, and continue their power by the ſame Arts they have gained it, & deny juſtice to the memory of his Majeſt: as before obedience to his Government. Thoſe whoſe power hath been gottē by the peoples credulitie would willingly deprive them of reaſon, whereby they might ſee their errour, which is the cauſe, that the Rebells having miſled many into the preſent miſcheyfe by Calumnies of inſufficiencie in his Majeſt: and diſaffection to the eſtabliſhed Religion, account anyproofe publiſhed to the contrary the plot of a faction againſt their Rebell Common-wealth, and although their often acceſſes to him, and debates with him during his reſtraint, and the obſervation of his devotion gave ſuch proofe of both, as diverſe of their followers were vndeceived both in him, and the cauſe they had proſecuted, yet this they would have an effect of faction, & any relation of his Maj: afflictions a deſigne. His Maj: actions neede no defence, the Rebells impious actions againſt him are incapable of any, & this Author hath ſome reaſon to coniecture, that all mention of the ſufferings of his late Maj: tends to the ruine of the Rebell power. True narrations of the horrid Actions of Traytours, though they recount the greatenes, & glory of theyr triumphs,

umphs, ſting them with an expectation of vengeance, & deſtruction of their power. There are a great number, that ſince they have ſeene that booke thinke it had been a great loſſe to the world, if it had periſhed, & yet they are farr from deſigne by it, and if it were publiſhed with any deſigne, it was an innocent one to publiſh what a murthered King, had left written of himſelfe for the reaſon of his Actions, and cleering of miſtakes.

The deſigne is now the third time to corrupt the people to the dishonour of the preſent Government, & retarde a generall peace ſo needeful to this afflicted nation.

They cannot ſay any were corrupted, that followed their King, vnles the lawes, their legall oaths, and Scripture it ſelfe corrupted them, for theis were the guides they followed, and the Rebells may reſt aſſured, that if there were not theſe bonds vpon the loyall Engliſh, humane Treatiſes, though never ſo excellent would little move them to the loſſe of life, and fortunes.

For the diſhonour of that, which he calls the preſent Government themſelves have written enough, though the King, and his partie were ſilent. Their power was gotten by often repeated propoſitions, & proteſtations, of affection, and loyaltie to his late Majeſt: which they never meant to performe, many falſe pretences to the people to defend the King, and eſtabiliſhed lawes, and Religion, breach of oaths, murther of the King, and of theis nothing can be denyed by themſelves, and there is nothing can be ſaid of any to dishonour beyound ſwearing, and fore ſwearing, Treaſon, and Murther. And can they thinke their peace is retarded by the Kings, partie, when themſelves have ſo often ſworne by the name af God in hipocriſie to deceive, made Religion

the Maſke of ſacriledge, and murther, and pretend pittie to the afflicted nation, while they afflict it & continue the ſame wickednes, where by they brought the miſerie vpon it? They may be ſure, though they deſtroy the King, and his partie, God will raiſe them Enemies they thinke not of, and prepare deſtroyers they feare not.

Its a Good deede (he ſajes) *to the living by remembring men of the truth of what they know to be miſaffirmed to keepe them from entring into warr.*

But it is wickednes to oppoſe truth, and offer that to be beleived by men which they know to be falſe. If this Author would remember men only of *truth*, he would finde no adverſary, and if his partie would act according ly, there would be no neede of *a new warr*, for then they would reſtore King, and lawes, but this Author by falſifying of Actions, att corrupting of principles endeavours to draw men into a ſtate of Rebellion againſt God, and their King, and make the warr endles, & the people helpeles, and his pretended Charitie is more odious, then the Hipocrites Almes, this reſpecting only ſelfe glory, that of this Author a ſnare to deſtroy others.

As to moment of ſoliditie (he ſayes) *in the booke it ſelfe ſtuft with nought els, but the Common grounds of Tyranny, and Poperie, ſuguered a little over, or any neede of anſwearing in reſpect of ſtayed, and well principled men, I take it on me, as a worke aſſigned rather then by me choſen, or affected.*

He would have it thought there was no moment of ſoliditie, becauſe he hath none in this Iconoclaſtes ſtuft full of the common grounds of Rebellion, & confuſion, which are only of Moment to the ſupport of vſurpation, the meaſure of his *well principeld men* to whome a rayling libell is more convincing, then a Logicall Argument.

That

That the booke is *ſtuft* with nought els, *but grounds of Tyrany, and Popery*, when the moſt part of his exceptions comprehended not thoſe heads is an Hiperbole vnbefitting any, but ſuch, as had ſacrificed ſhame, and conſcience to a wicked cauſe.

If the publiſhing of his Majeſt: booke as (he ſajes) conteyning nothing but *grounds of Tyrany, and Popery* were a deſigne of his partie, ſurely it muſt concurre with the Authors ends, for the cheife Calumnies, whereby the Rebells ſought to draw the peoples affections from his Majeſt: were, that he would introduce *Tyrany, and Popery* and the publiſhing of ſuch a booke in his Majeſt: name was moſt effectuall to make good, what was obiected. And the man, that thinkes the Kings partie ſo voyde of ſenſe, may thinke them *well principeld men*, that ſwallow ſuch crudities, as he hath provided for them, and they may be excuſed, if they be not moved with his Majeſt: booke, for it cannot be expected they ſhould vnderſtand, and receive reaſon, and for thoſe doubtles the Author writt his booke, for it could not be hoped, that they, who had any dram of reaſon, and had not reſolved to continue in Rebellious vndertakings againſt all the light of Religion, and reaſon would be fit readers of ſuch incoherent Barbarismes. *Grounds of Tyrany, and Popery* are not ſo ſubtile to escape all the world without the helpe of this authors finger to point att it, and had the booke conteyned any ſuch matter, he would have vſed leſſe rayling, and more reaſon, heate, & fowle language proceede from impotencie of defence, and thence is the greate noyſe of words, and inſignificant matter of Iconoclaſtes. Common angers disorder reaſon, but vnnaturall furious distempers deſtroy it. The preſent Traytours

att

att leaſt as many of them, as ſate in the beginning of his late Majeſt: Parliament, where this Rebellion was hatcht proteſted before God to defend with their lives, and fortunes the doctrine eſtablished in the Church of England, and that muſt conteyne the grounds of Popery, or the author will finde none in that booke, but in the ſence of Traytours: Church is Popery, & King, is Tyrany. If they, that aſſigned this worke on the Author differed not in judgment from him touching *moment of ſoliditie* in his Majeſt: booke, they ſhewed a very ſlight eſteeme of a Champion ſo confident of his parts, but they knew his malice, not his *ſoliditie*, And they knew it was in vaine for them to ſeeke to anſweare his Majeſt: booke with *ſoliditie*, falſities, and detractions being all their hopes, and they knew not a man els, whoſe credit they could more eaſily proſtitute, nor any man more greedy of ſo baſe ane imployment.

He ſajes *if the late King, had thought ſufficient thoſe anſweares, and defences made for him in his life time, they who on the other ſide accuſed his ill Government, judging enough had been replied, the heate of this controverſie was in likelihood drawing to an end, and the farther mention of his deedes, not ſo much vnfortunate, as faultie had in tendernes of his late ſufferings been willingly forborne, and perhaps for the preſent age have ſlept, while his adverſaries calmed with ſucces had been leſſe vnfavourable to his Memory:*

The late King, thought thoſe anſweares, and defences made for him in his life time a bundantly ſufficient, and ſo did all indifferent men, and it was not any thought of defect in theis, that moved him to write on particular occurrents of moſt moment in the time of his troubles, and as his memory will not ſtand, orfall att the Rebells cour-

courteſie, ſo their aſperſions will rather increaſe, then diminiſh it. This Author thinckes, that men are daunted with his Contumelies, and that if the King, had knowne what words he would have written againſt his booke, he would not have adventured vpon ſuch pikes, but as the Kingly Prophet David ſang to his harpe, and wrote his Divine meditations, while his Enemies ſent foorth *their ſharpe Arrowes, bitter words againſt him*, and that of ſo much venom, as he ſajes, *the poyſon of Aſpes was vnder their lipps*: ſo his late Majeſt: compoſed thoſe his meditations, while his Enemies compaſſed him on every ſide, and ceaſed not to perſecute him with their *Tongues ſet on fire of Hell*, and though his perſon ſuffered by them, his cauſe, and innocencie was a bove their reach.

His Majeſt: expected the vtmoſt of their malice after death vpon his name, as he had felt it in his life, and it was ſo farr from his deſire, that mention of his deedes ſhould be forborne, eſpecially thoſe his Enemies excepted to, that his endeavours were cheifely bent to make them manifeſt to the world with all the obiections, and invectives, that had been made againſt them, and time hath tought this Author, and others of his crew, that many have been convinced of the wickednes of theyr Rebellion, by the declarations, and replies they made againſt his late Majeſt: Truth feares nothing, but to be hidden, & his late Majeſt: needed noe other Advocate, then the cleere diſcoverie of his deedes, that he was vnfortunate was the greate wrath of God vpon the nation, where ſo many in the middeſt of ſo great bleſſings of peace, and plentie, as they enioyed vnder his Raigne, continued murmuring, and vnthanke full, and it is not the leaſt ſigne of the heavines of his diſpleaſure, that ma-

kes the people executioners of it, one vpon another, and that they ſhould act ſuch execrable wickednes by words, and Actions againſt that King, who was freeſt from perſonall vices, and publique preſſures of all his Predeceſſours, that had Raigned ſo long, as he had done. The preſent age muſt nedes have a deepe ſenſe of his loſſe, and poſteritie, aſwell, as ſtrangers will wonder, when they reade his ſtory, and finde ſuch groundles ſlanders, and barbarous cruelties acted againſt ſo eminent vertue, and the confidence in obtruding ſuch groſſe abſurdities, for reaſons, as are vſed by this Author and others, wilbe the infamy of the preſent age, when ſuch evident folly, and wickednes finde credit. Can any man be ſo ſtupid to thinke, that ſuch wretches, as boaſt of their deſtroying the innocent, will ceaſe to defame their memory? and that ſuch, as had no mercie on their lives, will have a tendernes of their ſufferings? That they, which ſuborned detractours, and rayſed lewde reports to give colour to their crueltie, would have a tendernes to him they had tormented, and expreſſe no tendernes for their owne villanies? It had been contrary to his Majeſt: wiſedome to have expected tendernes to himſelfe, from ſuch Monſters, and contrary to the nature of ſuch ſavage beaſts, to have their blood thirſtines ſlakt, or their crueltie *calmed* with any *ſucceſſes*.

But ſince himſelfe hath left this booke, as the beſt Advocate, and interpreter of his Actions, and his friends by publiſhing &c. and almoſt adoring it, ſeeme to place therein the ſtrength of their cauſe, it would argue doubtfullnes, and deficiencie of the other partie, not to meete his reaſon in any field, the force of whoſe Armes they have ſo often mett victoriouſly.

This libell more evidently proves the deficiencie of the

the Rebell partie, then the omiſſion of an anſweare could have argued, and all men ſee, they are not doubtfull, but convinced by their owne reaſon of the lewdenes of their Actions. It might be exepcted from the libellers mention of the eſteeme his Majeſt: booke hath amongſt his friends, that his anſweare ſhould be of equall account with his Maſters, and thereby the world may be informed how their cauſe hath been maintained. They pretend *to meete reaſon in any field*, but are reſolved to contradict it, and the Author will reproach, and deſpiſe truth, and reaſon, as his Maſters have fought againſt it, and ſince their impietie cannot be denyed, it muſt be avowed. They glory in their victories in the field, as theeves in their booties, and boaſt, *that they can doe miſcheife*, their victories being no other, then the poyſons and knives of Aſſaſſins, that have deſtroyed Princes, and ſucceſſe is the evidence of their faith, and reaſon.

He proceedes to ſay, that *he who at the Barr ſtood excepting againſt the forme, and manner of his Iudicature, and complained, that he was not heard, neither he, nor his friends ſhall have that cauſe now to finde fault being mett, and debated with in this Monumentall Court of his owne erectinge, and not only heard, but anſweared.*

But ſtill he is vnwillingly heard, and they, which tooke his blood without hearing, are loath to heare the cry of it and they endeavoured the ſame courſe with his booke, they had taken with him, to condemne it vnheard, and as this worke was not choſen, nor affected by Iconoclaſtes, ſo was not the occaſion acceptable to his Maſters.

It hath been reported of ſome high way robbers, that they vſe a forme of Judicature vpon the Traveller, when they take him, and condemne him ſolemnely to loſe his

purſe, and Iconoclaſtes holds it ſtrange, he ſhould ſtand excepting at the forme, and manner of their Judicature. It was the prodigie of inſolence, that Rebells preſumed to bring their King to the Barr, and the Prodigie of impudence in this libeller, that imagines an expectation of the Kings ſubmiſſion to a Tribunall of Traytours. But with Traytours, where ſtrength can act, right, and Juſtice, are ridiculous conſiderations, otherwiſe thoſe Monſters, that made themſelves Judges without the leaſt colour of authoritie (the lower howſe being not able to puinſh a wandring Rogue, which the law allowes a Coneſtable) would not ſo preſumptuouſly ſit in Judgment vpon a King, and not only their own but of another Kingdome; and profeſſe wonder, that any ſhould thinke, that they cannot bring any King, to the blocke, that they get into their hands. Who may not defend the ſins of intemperance to ſatisfie luſt, aſwell, as thoſe of crueltie to ſatiſfie ambition, and why might not Ric: 3: defame his mother, and Kill his nephewes to ſecure his Tyrany, aſwell, as theis men reproach, and Kill their King? doe outward ſolemnities legitimate Murthers, and is a profeſt villanie innocent, & a ſecret only Cryminall?

Though thoſe Murtherers, before whome he ſtood at the Barr excepting, had reſolved, that neither feare of God, nor reverence to their lawfull king, nor importunitie, that moves ſuch, as the other reſpects doe not, ſhould prevaile with them, yet he promiſes afaire debate, though he juſtifies them, and performes it with the ſame falſhood, offring clamorous reproaches and ſhamles vntruths, inſtead of anſweares, erecting a Monument for him ſelfe, wherein the defence of impietie, and ſcorne of truth have engraven his infamy in everlaſting Characters.

which

Which he ſajes to do effectually, if it be neceſſary that to his booke, nothing the more reſpect be had for being his, they of his owne partie, can have no juſt reaſon to exclaime.

Truly his owne partie had reaſon to expect, that from reſolved Traytours, his booke would have leſſe reſpect for being his, for having ſuffered greater crueltie in his perſon for being a King, could they thinke his booke would have more reſpect for being his? The Rebells themſelves have publiſhed it a rule, that a man borne in Scotland, while the Kingdomes ſtood divided, was not ſubject to their Judicature, and therefore they vrged againſt Duke Hamilton, that he was naturalized, and yet they ſubjected the King to their will, whome they could not pretend to have had that Ceremony, and by the law of theſe miſcreants, the King muſt be more ſubject to them then any of his ſubjects of that nation, and the Author might have ſpared the paines to ſeeke a reaſon for his impudent language, for his Majeſt: partie know, it was for the intereſt of his Trayterous cauſe, and a neceſſary effect of a Rebellious diſpoſition. The booke of any Author ought to finde reſpect according to its owne merit, and its folly, or injury to ſleight, or reproach it for the Authors ſake, and the like of a perſon for his office ſake, but they, that reproach an office inſtituted by God, or the perſon, that beares that office for the office ſake, will hate a booke for the good, that it conteynes, and the Kings partie will never exclaime for the Authors detraction of the booke, which they expected from him, but they have juſt reaſon to deteſt his inſolent language, and impious aſſertions.

It were too vnreaſonable, that he becauſe dead ſhould have libertie to ſpeake all evill of the Parliament, and they, be-

cauſe living, or any for them have leſſe Freedome.

Its too vnreaſonable to bely the dead, and to affirme his Majeſt: to ſpeake all evill of the Parliament, when he well knowes, that his Majeſt: ſpeakes nothing of them, but what this breaker confeſſes to be true, and if his Majeſt: had ſpoken evill of a faction in Parliament, its too vnreaſonable for him to cenſure it, who not only ſpeakes evill of a faction in Parliament, but is the Advocate of thoſe, that not only ſpeake evill of them, but have destroyed them. What if his Majeſt: had ſpoken evill of the Lords houſe, have this Authors Maſters done leſſe, that have taken it away? What if he had ſpoken evill of a part of the lower houſe, have they done leſſe, that have impriſoned, & expelled the Members? And if the King reprehend, or reprove his ſubjects in the capacitie of Parliament, or otherwiſe, it is not only vnreaſonable, but damnable for them to cenſure, and reproach him, and moſt deteſtable for every licentious Pamphletter to traduce, & vilifie him. Rebells vſe not only feirce arrogancie, but impudent petulancie, and it makes for their deſigne, that the ſcum of the people caſt of all reverence, and mention of ſuperiours.

Have not the preſent Traytours reproacht, and condemned the Parliament for their profeſſions of loyaltie, and dutie to the King? Have they not made that the higheſt Cryme, which the Parliament judged their neceſſary dutie to ſerve their King? And may not the King complaine of their dealing with him, as well, as this Author with his new Maſters? can Iconoclaſtes reprove the Parliaments vote, that it was Treaſon for the Army to overaw the Parliament, which he doth in being Advocate for the Army againſt them, And is it a Cryme in his Majeſt:

Majeſt: to repreſent their evill Actions againſt him? The Parliament voted a Treatie with the King, and voted his conceſſions to be a ſufficient ground for peace, the libeller taxes that vote for folly, and falſhood. The Army remove that Parliament, and call ſome Creatures of their owne the Parliament, and they togeather take the perſon of the King, and murther him notwithſtanding this Treatie, and vote of Parliament. If it were the Parliament, that voted the Treatie, and the conceſſions to be a ſufficient ground for peace, they muſt be Traytours by the Parliaments Judgment, that diſſolved them, and placed the name of Parliament vpon others, and this Author muſt ſpeake more evill of them, then his Majeſt: doth, or more of his Maſters, and might with farr more reaſon take on him the defence of the Tumults, as afterwards he doth, then the Parliament, for if the Parliament, may be modelled by Tumults, and are no longer a Parliament, then the leaders of the rabble, judge well of their Actions, then the King, in ſpeaking any thing againſt the Parliament, doth no more, then this Author confeſſeth the Tumults may doe, and himſelfe too. He might have claimed a priviledge to ſpeake for the dead, aſwell, as write againſt the King, being dead, for his Maſters murthered it, with the King, and its like he hath leave from his new Maſters to name it yet, for it will not ſtand well heereafter with their Goverment to name a Parliament, which may continue the memory of King, and Lords, and the new Repreſentatives will, when the Maſters are ready for it, make the name of Parliament, like an old Almanacke, and the Author wilbe forbidden to name it, as reaſon now forbidds the defence of their Actions againſt his Majeſt:

As

As he to acquitt himſelfe hath not ſpared his adverſaries, ſo to him in his booke no more Courtſhipp wilbe vſed, then he vſes, but what is properly his owne guilt, not imputed any more to his evill Councellours (a Ceremony vſed longer by the Parliament, then he deſired) ſhalbe laid heere without Circumlocutions at his owne doore.

Courtſhip, nor Civilitie could be expected from any, that tooke on them the defence of ſuch a cauſe, as this Author hath done, and his Majeſt: moderation in ſpeaking of his adverſaries, ſtigmatizeth this Author for his vnprovoked inſolence, and malitious falſhood, and the cauſe he maintaynes, that could not ſtand, but by rayling, and ſlander.

In laying the ground worke of this horrid Rebellion, the Maſter worke men ſaw, that people are to be debaucht by degrees, and they cannot ſuddenly beleive abſurdities, till their paſſions by Cuſtome be made Master of their reaſon; and confirmed in the purſuite of what was propounded to them, vnder pretence of their good. The people then held it a ſin to offer violence to the perſon of their King, They thought they could not cut of the lappe of his garment. They held it odious to reproach his perſon, and the Parliament had ſo often declared, that kings, can doe no wrong, and that the law forbidds the ſpeaking of it, that though the wickednes of ſome were enough confirmed to wiſh his deſtruction, they durſt not ſay it, but pretend deſire of Juſtice againſt other perſons, and they reſolved, as Aſſaſſines to ſtabb him, while they kneeled to him, and to betray him profeſſing dutie, and loyaltie, vnderminınge his authoritie, with aſperſions on his evill Councellours, as they called them. And as then they laid faults vpon his Councellours,

that

that never acted, ſo now this ſlanderer will make the King guiltie of Actions, that were never done by him and vnder pretence of not ſparing him in laying the guilt on him, that was properly his, ſeekes to lay all mens faults on him, and is as diſloyall to truth, as Loyaltie.

To acquit himſelfe his Majeſt: needed to be very carefull, for his adverſaries by their declarations have done it, and they have acquitted his Councellours of theſe very Crymes they objected to them, for this Author wil have the faults they were charged with to be the Kings, and it is in his Language a Ceremonie to accuſe men falſely, & by forged Calumnies to ſeduce the people to the ſpending of their blood, and hazard of their ſoules. This Author is the firſt, that ſought to be beleived in an Apologie for falſhood, and to defend the Parliament, and yet contradict it, ſayes theiſe deceites, and lies were in Ceremonie. Its certaine the King endeavoured to vndeceive the people, that they might have knowne, that the malice of theſe Traytours was to himſelfe, whatever they pretended againſt his evill Councellours, & this Author makes traynes of Treaſon, framed of knowne vntruths to be only Ceremonies, and rankes the fifth, & ninth Commaundement in the Ceremoniall law, & as many of the reſt, as the breach may be made ſerviceable to their deceites. If the reproofe of evill ſpeaking againſt Kings in Scripture be a Ceremonie, if dutie, and loyaltie be a Ceremonie, if veracitie be a Ceremonie, what is morall in this Authors jugdment? Thoſe, whome he calls the Parliament vſed thoſe impoſtures, vntill they had drawne the people to eſtabliſh thier owne ſlavery, and the Empire of thoſe miſcreants over them, and now they laugh at theſe miſerable people, that thus beleived them, as

they doe at the fineſſe of their fraudes, and deſpiſe the power of God, as they doe his Precepts. It is ſufficiently evident to the world, what promiſes, & profeſſions thoſe the Author calls the Parliament vented to make his late Majeſt: a glorious King, & beſides their legall oaths, they deviſed new proteſtations of loyaltie, and this the Author calls a Ceremonie to make the world beleive they were loyall to their King, fot the Actions they intended needed ſtrong Charmes to delude the people, & make them beleive thoſe men loyall to the King, that rayſed a warr againſt him. The Parliament in one of their declarations told the King, that if they ſhould ſay, that the evill Acts they complained of were done by his Maj: they ſhould ſpeake contrary to the law, and the Teſtimonie of their owne hearts. In another, that they were ready to lay downe their lives, and fortunes, and ſpend the laſt dropp of their blood to maintaine his Crowne, and Royall perſon in greatenes, and glory, and caſt themſelves downe at his Royall feete. What would he have the world thinke of this ſo ſtoutly acted vehemence only a Ceremonie? Certainly one of the moſt pernitious, that ever was practiſed, and an impudent defence ſuites well with a diſcovered falſhood. They profeſſe themſelves Enemies to ſtage playes, but it is, that they might engroſſe the trade to themſelves, for their Pulpits, aſwell, as Pamphlets ſound principally this repreſentation of paſſion, & ſtage devotion, but it is a ſolleſiſme in ſo greate an actor, as this Author, that ſpeakes alowde, that all is but a Ceremonie, for he thereby gives the world to vnderſtand, that he intends the ſame falſhood in his ſlanders, then the faction in Parliament vſed in their profeſſions of dutie, and loyaltie.

This

This courſe of his in laying the faults on the King he ſayes is, that they, who from the beginning, or but now of late by what vnhappines he knowes not are ſo much infatuated not with his perſon only but with his palpable faults, & dote vpon his deformities, may have none to blame, but their owne folly, if they live, and die in ſuch a ſtrok'n blindnes, as next to that of Sodom hath not happened to any ſort of men more groſſe, or more misleadinge.

Wee have found many by hellish impulſion hating his Majeſt: perſon, and authoritie, and ſeeme not to thinke, that God hath given them vp to a reprobate ſenſe, and ſtrong deluſion, & would be thought to beleive all thoſe, that love, or honour their King infatuated, and thence it is, that the Author knowes not by what vnhappines it is, that men are ſo infatuated, for he would have it beleived a greate happines to hate, and deteſt his King, to reproach not only his perſon, but his office Perſecutors endeavour to make them vnhappy, on whome they exerciſe their cruelties, and they wonder at thoſe, that run not with them to the ſame degree of wickednes, & this Author makes it an vnknowne vnhappines, that men runnot from their proteſted, and ſworne Allegiance, and loyaltie into ſo diſperate a Rebellion, as he maintaines, he may well ſay he knowes not by what vnhappines it comes, but it is an vnhappines of greater wonder, that ſoe many ſhould renounce the very names of loyaltie, and obedience, make Rebellion the moſt renowned vertue, and this after ſoe many vowes, and oaths to the contrary, that men, who ſome few yeares ſince profeſſed the greateſt hatred of a Traytour to their King, ſhould now thinke no man ſoe prayſe worthy, nor any blindnes ſoe neere to that miraculous ſtroke of the men of Sodom, as that of the opinion of loyaltie.

If his Majeſt: faults had been, as palpable, as this Authors falſhood, it could not diminiſh his ſubjects dutie, nor excuſe the Rebells impietie, nor the taunting ſcurrilitie of this Author, but his vertue being ſoe eminent, calls for vengeance on the heads of thoſe, that call good evill, and evill good, this prodigious blindnes is a beginning of his puniſhment, that finding noe man abroade, or at home of learning, Religion, or ſobrietie, that deteſt not the courſes, which he ſeekes to defend, and this ſoe knowne to him, yet he objects blindnes to them all, and as thoſe negroes, that paint the Devill white will have none free from blindnes, but ſuch, as Rebell againſt him, that ſent that blindnes vpon the men of Sodom, while they inhumanely purſued their wikednes, and while theſe men with fury breake downe the fences of humane ſocietie, and ſeeke to turne men into beaſts, the ſpirit, that rules in the children of diſobedience hath blinded their eyes, and taken poſſeſſion of their ſoules confirming their ſin not only without remorſe, but with augmented impudence, their writings being compoſed of language to outface truth, and jeere at pietie.

If this Author had intended a right information of men, as he pretends, he would not have played the painter in every period, as he hath done in making Chimeraes, and goblins to affright men. Can he hope, that any reading his booke, will conceive him rightly relating Actions, or caſes that tells men they are blinde, infatuated with the palpable faults of their Murthered King, and doting vpon his deformities? Doe not men ſee he bends his ſtrength to miſleade thoſe, that ſee, & reteyne thoſe in blindnes, that were like to recover.

Some men have by Policie accompliſhed after death that revenge

venge vpon their Enemies, which in life they were not able, and inſtances, *that the will, and legacies of Cæſar, being read, wrought more in the vulgar to the avenging of his death, then all the art he could vſe to win their favour in his life.*

Its true, that the vertue, and worth of many injured perſons, hath appeared more evidently after their death, and hath cauſed greife, and repentance in their Enemies moving revenge in thoſe, that were ſeduced to deſtroy them, and the cruelties exerciſed on his late Majeſt: and his eminent vertues in his ſufferings have manifeſted vnto many, how vnhappily they were miſlead to the deſtruction of a King, of ſo greate goodnes, and to place their confidence in ſuch falſe, and bloody hipocrites. But he ſajes thoſe Apologies, and meditations are over late. Its true they cannot prevent the evill paſt, and the Author holds their ſtrength invincible, though he be not confident of mens inclinations without the efficacie of his pen. But would thoſe Apologies, and meditations have been more powerfull, if ſooner knowne? Truth will wreſt ſome thing from him vnawares, for he muſt confeſſe, if men, that were drawne into this Rebellion againſt his late Majeſt: by ſlanders, had vnderſtood what now they doe by this booke, they had ſtayed long before, and it wilbe a greate vnhappines to the poore people of his Majeſt: Dominions, if they be ſoe over late vndeceived, that they be not able to revenge his blood, nor redeemce themſelves from the yoke of thoſe Traytours, vnder whome they ſerue.

This intent he ſajes *appeares by the conceited portraiture before his booke drawne out to the full meaſure of a maſking ſcene, and ſet there to catch fooles, and ſily gazers.*

And are Portraitures of the condition of perſons, and

their ſufferings only to catch fooles, and ſilly gazers, to what end then is the portraict of the houſe of Commons with the ſpeaker in his Eminence, and the reſt ſet in a ſerious poſture ſoe frequently publiſhed? And are the portraitures in M^R. ffoxes booke of the Acts, and monuments of Martirs only to catch fooles, and ſilly gazers? The Authors catching at flies ſhewes the impotencie of his malice, and diſorder in his vnderſtanding.

Next this intent appeares by the latine wordes. Vota dabunt, quæ bella negarunt. Intimating that what he could not compaſſe by warr, he ſhould atcheive by his meditations, for in wordes, which admit of various ſenſe, the libertie is ours he ſajes *to chuſe that, may beſt minde vs of what our reſtles Enemies endeavour.*

In words of various ſence that interpretation is to be choſen, which is moſt probable to be the Authors meaninge, an interpretation for politique ends is vningenuous, and iniurious, and when it is againſt the apparent ſignification odious, and the Author ſhewes with what candor he deales, that makes conſtructions to ſerve his turne, & leaſt the truths conteyned in his Majeſt: booke ſhould prevaile with any, he will make ſuch a ſenſe, as may prevent the right vnderſtanding of them. His Majeſt: prayers, and deſires through his whole booke, whereto the latine words are referred were directed to God for bleſſings vpon his Kingdomes, and reſtoring right, and Juſtice to them, and all men may hope they will have a gracious acceptance, and returne from the Almightie, though the warrs procured it not, but this Author will referr theſe wordes to the publiſhing of the booke, becauſe it beſt mindes them to prevent what their Enemies endeavour, and becauſe it may vſher in a conceite, which he makes much of.

For

For he ſayes *heere may be well obſerved the looſe, and negligent curioſitie of thoſe, who tooke vpon them to adorne the ſetting foorth of this booke, for though the picture in the front would Martir him, and ſaint him to befoole the people, the lattine Motto, which they vnderſtand not leaves him as it were a politique contriver.*

The lattine being taken in the right ſenſe, what roome had there been for this curious obſervation? And if they, which ſet foorth his Majeſt: booke had been curiouſly, or ſtupidly negligent, the Author had detracted nothing from his Majeſt: It is not the picture but the crueltie exerciſed vpon him, that made him a Martir, and theſe miſcreants are enraged to ſee their owne Actions in picture, which they ſhamed not to commit in the face of the world. The picture is farr ſhort of the meaſure of his Majeſt: pietie, and ſufferings, and wee may expect hard meaſure vpon the booke, when a picture in the front cannot eſcape the Image breaker. This Author its likely wrote from them, that vnderſtood not lattine, that ſeekes to make the front, and lattine in the end ſo different, when the front hath a picture in the poſture of prayer, and the lattine in the end is applied to the efficacy of prayer. If he had expected to worke on ſuch, as vnderſtood lattine, he would not have obtruded ſuch an inſignificant obſervation of miſconſtrued lattine. Doth the commendatious of a mans devotions ſhew him a politique contriver?

They that publiſhed his Majeſt: booke are heerein free from that negligent curioſitie, the Author would have ſeene by contriving a ſenſe, which himſelfe will not affirme to be theirs, which vſed the words, but his owne by a libertie of choice, where are different ſenſes to be made,

made, but the Author ſhewes himſelfe, an vnpolitique contriver of detraction, when he inſerts the detection of it in the relation.

Quaint Emblems, and devices begg'd from the old Pageantry of ſome twelf nights entertainment at white hall will doe but ill to make a ſaint, or Martir.

The Traytours are loath to ſee the Emblems of their owne inhumane crueltie, and how inſteed of harmeles Pageantry they erected the Theatre, of their Barbarous villanie at white hall. The wickednes of thoſe, that Martired his Majeſt: may be ſhadowed by Emblems, but neither art, nor wit can fully expreſſe it. Bloody Maſſacres are the Pageantry of Tyrants, and the ſcritches of Martirs their Muſique.

If the people reſolve to take him ſainted at the rate of ſuch a Cannonizing, I ſhall he ſayes *ſuſpect their Calender more, then the Gregorian.*

He is very Kinde, that will ſuſpect their *Calender* no more then the *Gregorian*, for that *Calender* which hath nothing peculiar, or notable, bnt the new account of the yeare is received by a greate part of the world for the trueſt, and if the Author have no greater averſion from the *Calender* he ſuppoſes, he is likely very neere the beleife of it, but it ſeemes he had a minde to make a conceite from the word *Calender* & therefore produceth the *Gregorian Calender* of computation, inſteed of the *Calender* of ſaints. The Authors Pageantry playing with a picture is not the way to vncannoinze a ſaint. The peoples opinion of his Majeſt: ſanctitie is not wrought by a picture, and if they have any eſteeme of ſuch repreſentations of his ſufferings their juſt paſſion condemnes this Authors malitious detractions.

The

The Memoriall of the juſt ſhalbe bleſſed in deſpight of the malice, and ſcorne of men. God lookes on their ſufferings, puts all their teares into his bottle, and their death is right deare in his ſight. And if we looke vpon the eminencie of the Sufferer, the pride, and crueltie of the perſecutors, the true cauſes on the part of the ſufferer, or the pretended cauſes of ſuffering on the part of the perſecutors, we ſhall finde few Parallells in Calenders among ſaints to that of his late Majeſt: and its memorable in his ſtory, that his perſecutors their expreſſions ſo much reſemble the curſed Jewes, that crucified our bleſſed ſaviour. This man would make his Majeſt: after death a politique contriver, the Jewes our bleſſed ſaviour a deceiver. This Author pretends a plot to worke by this booke publiſhed after his Majeſt: death that revenge, which he could not obteine in his life, the curſed Jewes pretended the beleife of our ſaviours reſurrection of greater danger, then his Miracles in his life time. Such as preſerve the Memory of the ſufferings of holy men in *Calenders* have Zeale for their warrant, and it was an ancient practice in the Church of God, and ſuch, as deride that Cuſtome to caſt reproach vpon the perſons, they have perſecuted, will have their memories rott, as they have their faces hardned, and their conſciences ſeared. We may ſee what anſweare this Author intends to his Majeſt: booke, that makes ſuch obſervations vpon the Claſpe, & frontiſpice. Is it the way to confute a booke to revile the printer. Iconoclaſtes hath an indignation at any holy meditations in his Majeſt: booke, and tells men there is danger of a Deſigne, and to keepe men from reading it gives Caveatts againſt the outſide.

In one thing he muſt commend his openneſſe, who gave the Title

to this booke ΕΙΚΩΝ ΑΚΛΑΣΤΟΣ *that is to ſay the Kings Image, & by the ſhrine he dreſſes out for him, certeinly would have the people come, and worſhipp.*

Was man made to be worſhipt, becauſe the Scripture tells vs, he was created in the Image of god. And is this author ſo greate a ſtranger to the expreſſions of ſuch, as writ the lives, & Actions of woorthy perſons, who terme ſome men patternes, or Images of Kings, Captaines, Judges, and the like? and when his Majeſt: booke conteyned ſuch Kingly meditations was it improperly named Icon-baſilice. Such ſorry Jeſts ſhew more will, then witt to ſpeake ſome what, and the confidence of his ſlanders are the ſame with his conceites, that binds this trivial ſcoffe with a certenly.

For which reaſon this anſweare is intitled Iconoclaſtes the famous ſurname of many Greeke Emperours, who in their zeale to the commaund of god after long tradition of Idolatrie in the Church tooke courage, & brake al ſupperſtitious Images to peices.

And the end of this anſweare is to breake all good Emperours, aſwell, as Kings to peices, and the Author made an improper choice, of the *famous ſurname of good Emperours*, that reproaches their calling, and juſtifies the violence done them for that very worthy Act of theirs in breaking ſuperſtitious Images, for if the people may judge their Kings for their Actions in Church, or State, how will this Author exempt the good Emperour Leo from the Juſtice of the peoples violence againſt him for breaking downe of Images, for he muſt confeſſe their power to vſe violence, if he will erect a Tribunall in the people over their Kings, as he doth over his owne. Poets have fancied transformations, and men turned into Beaſts, & noe age hath produced more Monſters in opinion touching

hing Religion, and moralitie, then this of ours, that glory in their defacing of the Image of God in man by Creation, and in Kings, and governours by inſtitution, and if every man may vſe violence againſt his King vpon his owne authoritie, and the murther of Kings be an Act of Juſtice, whereto muſt mankinde be reduced, but to be Tigers, or Devills in deſtroying one another? And they cannot deny, but what may be done to a King, may be done to any other, ſchiſme and Rebellion are inſeperable Companions, and as this Author defames the Kingly Government, ſo the Church may not eſcape his fury, for rather, then it ſhall have any eſtimation, he will have a long tradition of Idolatry before thoſe good Emperours, but if he had vouchſafed to reade the ſtory, and depended not vpon his ſpirits, he would have found, that not tradition, but an impious Rebellion ſtirred vp againſt a good Emperour brought the ſuperſtitious Images into the Church, and that the good Emperour with ſtood the bringing in of them, not brake them downe after long Tradition, and thence he might have told vs what kinde of reformation muſt be expected from popular fury, and that as then by Tumultuous violence ſuperſtition was eſtabliſhed, ſo now in England confuſion, and prophanenes. This Image breaker thinkes he may aſwell vſurpe an Emperours ſurname, as his Maſters their Kings power, and Eſtate, and while he magnifies the good Emperours corrects himſelfe, leaſt the people thence thinke on their reverence to their King. For he ſayes *the people exorbitant, and exceſſive in all their motions are prone oft times not to a Religious only, but to a Civill kinde of Idolatrie in Idolizinge their Kings, though never more miſtaken in the object of their worſhipp, heeretofore being wont to repute for ſaints thoſe*

faithfull, and coragious Barons, who loſt their lives in the field making glorious warrs againſt Tyrants for the common libertie.

Never time can better witnes this truth, then the preſent, that the people are exorbitant, and exceſſive in all their motions, nor ever man, that put pen to paper could more improperly lay it on their ſcore, then this Author, that takes on him to defend the moſt exorbitant, and exceſſive motions of the people, that any Kingdome hath felt, the power of his Maſters being founded on thoſe motions, and if the people yet ſee not their errour, they cannot longer be deceived having ſuch a Teſtimonie, as this Author a man without exception in that poi nt, and its likely they begun to ſee, how they were made inſtruments of their owne ſlavery, that this Author gives ſo ſevere a Character of the people. If they be prone to a Religious Idolatrie, as the Author ſayes they are, they are very vnfit Reformers of the Church, and for that Civill kinde of Idolatrie in Idolizing their Kings, that is in an eminent degree of obedience, for ſuch appeares his meanings, it wil never prove ſin to them, and the contrary vice Rebellion is more frequent, and more dangerous to their ſalvation, and many will goe to heaven with this Civill kinde of Idolatrie, when Rebells, and deſpiſers of Dominion wilbe excluded. The Author ſhould have done well to tell, what this Civill kinde of Idolatrie is, if it differs from true, obedience, and whether it may not be given to others, aſwell, as Kings. I beleive if there be ſuch a Civill kinde of Idolatrie, the worſt degree of it is in the reverence borne to King killers, and common deſtroyers of their Countrey, as the ſtories of all times teſtifie. Rebells never wanted pretentions, but libertie, and Juſtice were the common Maske of ſuch Monſters, ſo

this

this man wil have the world beleive the pretences of Rebells, and that Rebellion was allwayes the lawfull ſide, and thence thoſe faithfull, and couragious Barons, that had broken their faith, and Alleagiance to their King, Trayterouſly armed the multitude for private revenge, and ambition muſt be ſainted, & thoſe whome the cleere evidence of law judged Traytours, and their warrs Rebellion muſt be the patrons of common libertie. I thinke the Author will hardly finde a *Calender* of ſuch *ſaints*, if he receive a *Connonization at ſuch a rate*, it will deſerve farleſſe credit, then the *Gregorian Calender*, but he is not like to finde a *Calender* of ſaints for his purpoſe, vnles it be filled with ſuch faithles Traytours. It hath been ſaid of Politicians, that they love the Treaſon, and hate the Traytour, but theſe new Maſters ſaint the Traytours, & make Treaſon the Canon of their Religion. Some men have pitied men of parts, whoſe paſſions have carried them into vnwarrantable Actions, but never till this age did Chriſtians adore ſuch ſaints. Rebellion is dearer to this Author, then Religion, and he will rather commend ſuperſtitious Actions of a blinde age, and the very dreggs of Popery againſt which he profeſſeth ſo greate Zeale, then want an ingredient to the varniſh of that horrid ſin, and rather then that ſhalbe diſcountenanced, Popery, and Judaiſme it ſelfe ſhalbe admitted. There were a people, that Idolized Todes, and vipers and all venemous creatures, and theſe men have reſumed that Idolatry, that will have the moſt cruell, and deſtructive impieties to make men ſaints.

He inſtances in two particulars *Simon de Montfort Earle of Leiceſter againſt Hen. 3. and Thomas Plantagenet Earle of Lancaſter againſt Edward 2.*

For the firſt of theſe, he was by the Teſtimony of the ſtories of that age the moſt ingrate full Rebell, that any ſtate hath harboured, a man overloaden with his Maſters favours, matcht to his ſiſter, intruſted with his ſecretts, and his forces, yet this man, whome neither benifitts, affection, nor truſt could oblidge, nor keepe from thruſting the King from his Throne, & aſſuminge the Government to himſelfe for the common libertie, as the Author will have it, is enrolled for *a ſaint*. If there were any ſo *exorbitant, and exceſſive in their motions to ſaint* ſuch a faithleſſe wretch, the Author will hardly finde any ſo much miſtaken in his Civill Kinde of Idolatry to their Kings, but whence comes Hen: 3: to be a Tyrant, of whome the ſtories report ſo much mildnes, and hardly ſo greate an errour, as the vnadviſed advancement of that Rebell Montfort? But it is very vſuall with theſe men, that wherever they finde an Example of *Rebellion* there the King is a *Tyrant*, and all ſuch Preſidents, as were conveyed to our times to ſhew vs the miſcheife, and wickednes of *Rebellion* are produced, as authorities for the committing of it, and Garnetts ſtraw wilbe a Miracle, and he a *ſaint*, & the Aſſaſſins of Kings *glorious Champions for common libertie*. For the ſecound, the ſtories are very ſilent of any common libertie pretended by the *Earle of Lancaſter*, or any Tyrany againſt that King, but it matters not what truth there be in an aſſertion ſo a King be made the Criminall, and though the miſtake of ſuch, as held the Earle of Lancaſter for ſome time a ſaint, were ridiculous to that very age, yet this Author will have it a leſſe errour, then the keeping of the fifth Commaundement, and the people, that vſed *a Civill Kinde of Idolatry* to their good Emperour, that had the *famous ſurname of Iconoclaſtes more miſtaken in the*

the object of their worſhipp, then ſuch, as *Idolized* the *ſuperſtitious Images* he had broken, for the Author ſayes *they were never more miſtaken in the object of their worſhipp, then in the Civill Kinde of Idolatrie in Idolizing their Kings.*

Its apparent in the ſtories of our nation, that ſuperſtitious Churchmen had their hands in thoſe *Rebellions* the Author mentions, & therefore might induce the ignorant rabble to adore the Calves they had ſet vp, & in our dayes wee finde they have ſucceſſours, that teach the people *doctrines of Devills* and ſeduce them from obedience to thoſe, that had the rule over them.

Now with a beſotted, and degenerate baſeneſſe of ſpirit, excepte ſome few, who yet reteine in them the old Engliſh fortitude, and love of freedome, and have teſtified it by their matchles deedes, the reſt embaſtardized from the antient noblenes of their Anceſtours are ready to fall flat, and give adoration to the Image, and memory of this man, who hath offred at more cunning fetches to vndermine our libertie, and put Tyrany into an Act, then any Britiſh King before him.

Its very ſtrange, that *all excepte ſome few* are ſo beſotted, as not to love libertie ſo naturall to man, and thoſe, that have ſo contended for it, as the *Engliſh* nation, but if it were poſſible for Iconoclaſtes to deale faithfully, wee might have expected, that he would have told vs, what that libertie was the people loved not, which is the libertie of thoſe ambitious Traytours, that now lord it over them, which are thoſe few he mentions, whoſe matchleſſe villanies have waſted more Engliſh blood in theſe few yeares, then all our Kings in their victorious warrs ſince the conqueſt. The people doubtles love libertie, but they finde themſelves cheated of their juſt libertie vnder a lawfull King, and brought vnder the ſlavery of many

many Tyrants who perſwaded the poore people it was libertie to be without a King, though ſubject to the licentious will of vpſtart vſurpers, and why is it degnerate baſenes of ſpirit to vindicate their lawes, & liberties againſt Tyrants, that have vſurped it, and revenge the fraude, & iniury done them by deceivers, that vnder pretence of law, and libertie bereft them of both. The beſt of the *Rebells* pretence, which this Author defends is to fight for *libertie*, and if the people finde their libertie taken away, is it vnlawfull to reſume it from Tyrants, and vſurpers, which this Author holds lawfull Kings? Its true men were beſotted with the name of *libertie*, and thoſe Mountebanques infuſed the principles of *Rebellion* into the people by telling there could be no libertie vnder *Monarchy*, as if the nature of Governments were vnknowne till our time, and thence this Author writes, as if none, but beſotted people ſhould reade him. If theſe vipers had profeſſed in the beginninge of their Rebellion, that *Simon Monford, & Thomas Earle of Lancaſter had been ſaints*, and that they intended to follow the Example of ſuch Traytours, the people would not have been ſo beſotted, the miſeries brought on the Kingdome by ſuch ſeducers being ſo largely delivred in ſtory, but the people have now found by ſad experience, that the leaders of the preſent diſorders are the Progenie of thoſe curſed Rebels, whoſe Actions made them odious to all poſteritie, and diſhonoured the times wherein they lived, and this Author would brand the whole nation making Rebellion their fortitude, and love of freedome, when its plaine to all readers, that thoſe Rebellions were the ſcourge of the nation, which langiuſhed vnder the burthens, that were encreaſed by thoſe, whome they followed againſt their kings.

How

How the people have been *Idolized* by thoſe *Rebells*, Tumults defended, and the power over their king pretended for the juſtification of this odious Rebellion, beſides the declaration of thoſe they call a Parliament, this Author frequently tells vs in this anſweare, & yet is ſoe careleſſe of truth, or ſhame, as heere their reaſon, and affection are as contemptible, as their right in Government, and ſome few muſt raigne over them. The greateſt vnhappines of the Engliſh nation hath been in the misfortunes of their kings, & the greateſt diſhonour in the prevalence of inſolent, and ſly Rebells, the noble blood of the moſt renowned perſons being waſted in thoſe diſorders, and Civilitie for many yeares deſtroyed. If we place vertue in the inſolent attempts of Rebells againſt lawfull Princes, not only Chriſtian fortitude, but morall vertue grow contemptible, & rage, and venom will ſooner get a ſaint-ſhipp, then Juſtice or innocence.

If *ſo many are ſo ready to fall flat to the Image, and memory of his late Majeſt:* as the Author ſayes, his Maſterts have cauſe to vſe new principles, and as they fought againſt their king by faining a power in the people, ſo they muſt now lay fetters on them, and caſt away the maske a *Ceremony* to be vſed no longer.

It was not a part of our liberties to be deprived of our king, nor to Rebell againſt him, ſuch acts being contradictions not only to *Chriſtian*, but *Engliſh libertie*, and ſuch, as take that libertie to themſelves, robb others of their juſt, & lawfull *liberties*. Doe the preſent, or did ever Traytours give libertie to any, but their faction? And doe they allow them any more, then libertie at the will of the Commaunder? And if libertie be ſo precious to theſe men, why ſhould John lilborne bemore reſtrained,

then Iconoclaſtes? And why ſhould any be more Cryminall, that write, or ſpeacke againſt an vſurped power, then they, that wrote againſt the knowne legall authoritie? Priſoners in Gayles hire perſons of ſtrong voyces to begg for them att the grate, and the Rebells have found this Authors rancour, and impudence ſo ſublimated, as his falſities, and ſlanders were probable to infect the world, though to knowing, and honeſt men they ſound the voyce of a Beaſt, and not a man; what one libertie of the Engliſh Nation is there now left? Doe not all men ſee, that their ridiculous howſe, and ſtate Councell act at the will of their ſword Maſter, by whoſe act thoſe Cyphers are diſpoſed of to ſignifie what he pleaſeth? Doe not all men ſee, that the vſe of the name libertie ſignifieth nothing, but a ſound to fill the peoples eares, and deceive their vnderſtandinge?

That Tyranny ſhould be objected to the beſt King, in whoſe time fewer men ſuffred death, then in any time of like extent throughout all our Kings, ſhewes helliſh rage, not common impudence. In his Raigne of ſixteene yeares, vntill this abominable Parliament, one only Peere of the Kingdome ſuffered death, & that not for any provocation, or offence againſt the Kings perſon, but for Crymes of another nature, a raritie in the ſtories of the beſt Kings, and yet ſo brutiſh is this man to ſay, that *he hath offred at more cunning fetches to vndermine our liberties, and put Tyrany into an art, then any brittiſh King before him.* Wherein ſhould Tirany appeare, was there any violence vſed in taking away mens Eſtates? Can they object Covetouſnes, or luxury to his late Majeſt: they have not yet pretended it, but they would make Tyrany by imagination, & that Government which ſtands in their way

muſt

muſt be called Tyrany, and the want of inſtances of Tyrany makes them thus giddily ſtagger from ſide to ſide, and talke of *offring at more cunninge fetches*, what doth this ſignifie? Doth this Author thinke, that he wilbe beleived in his ſlanders of Tyrany, when all is reſolved into *offers*, & *offers at cunning fetches*, and all is only their malicious, & inconſequent inferences? This Author well knowes this aſſertion of his, is ſo farr from truth, that he cannot name one Act of his Maj: wherevnto he, or his Maſters have excepted, that wants Example of his beſt Predeceſſours, ſo wide hath he opened his mouth in ſaying more then any *Britiſh King* before him. And his late Majeſt: tooke not ſuch Examples, as thoſe men, that make Acts of violence, and Rebellion *Examples*, but ſuch Actions, as were *by Councell*, and in the *way of law*, and *Iuſtice*. But this Author having ſo lately mentioned the old *Engliſh fortitude*, how falls he to name the Britiſh Kings? If he intend the Kings, which the *Romans* found at their comming, or which ſuceeded their departure, his compariſon is not of any large ſignification, for the Catalogue is very ſhort, and the Actions leſſe, but perhapps he meanes to make *Authenticke* the ſtory of *Geoffry of Monmouth*, where the Catalogue hath as litle truth, as the perſons Actions, he doth not meane the *Saxons* to be *Britiſh Kings?* If he doe, he will finde among them not only *offers at fetches*, but open rapines, and homicides, which when he thinkes on, what he hath written might ſhame him, if he could ſhame at any thing, and if he thought knowing readers would have the patience to perveſe ſo much ſcurrilous language, and impudent vntruth, as he hath packt togeather in this booke, he would expect juſt reproach for offering at ſuch a Compariſon ſo impertinent,

nent, if he intended ſuch Kings only, as were properly termed *Brittiſh* in regard of diſcent, whoſe perſons, and Actions are ſo inconſiderable, and ſo lewdely falſe. If he intend all others, that have Raigned in England, whoſe ſtories conteine ſo evident a refutation of his vntruth.

In the firſt Parliament of King James, there was a debate touching the Kings Title, which he deſired to have of *greate Brittaigne* in reguard of his Dominion over the whole Iſland, the lower howſe then reputed wiſe, much oppoſed it, and would reteine the name of *England*, vnder which name they ſaid their Anceſtours had been famous. Theſe men tell vs noe contentions are infallible, but the preſent, and they are in love with the name of *Brittiſh Kings*, of whome they know nothing, that the people may forget their Engliſh Kings, that made them famous.

Wee reade of ſome in Scripture, that wrought miſcheife by a law, and this Author, that talkes of making *Tyrany* an art, ſtrives to make Rebellion a law, and all Government a *Tyrany*, and having vndermined *Monarchy* with cantinge termes of *Libertie*, ſeekes to ſuppreſſe all *Libertie* by lawleſſe power. He doth not wonder, though he pretend it at the change in the people, for the many odious lyes, and ſlanders his Maſters have vſed of the King, the many promiſes they have falſified to the people, the cōtinual oppreſſions they exerciſe over them juſtly provoke hatred to ſuch *Tyrants*, vnles the people were condemned to perpetuall ſtupiditie with their preſent ſlavery.

The *Rebells*, whome this Author reports to be *Sainted*, though they objected miſgovernment to their Kings, never were ſo impudent to pretend their lawes ſlavery, but the

the preſent Traytours have improved all the impieties of former ages to extreamitie, and they call all the *Government of England*, for many hundreds of yeares *Norman ſlavery*, and will imagine a libertie that periſht by the flood, which they now reſume. Their pretence of lawes is turned into ſickely fancies of diſtempered braines, & though the leaders are hardened by their confirmed corruptions, the people begin to recover their vnderſtanding, and ſee the *cunning fetches*, whereby they were vndermined, and the Art, which Traytours vſed to betray them.

Which low dejection, and debaſement of minde in the people, he cannot willingly aſcribe to the naturall diſpoſition of an Engliſhman, but rather to two other cauſes.

And *is it a low dejection, and debaſement of minde* to reſtue a mans ſelfe from a common cheate, or a malicious oppreſſour? Is it not *dejection, and debaſement of ſpirit* to follow detected villaines, and common theeves? Is it the *naturall diſpoſition of an Engliſhman* to betray, and kill his King, & put his necke vnder the yoke of his inferiours? Is the *Engliſh diſpoſition* ſo baſe, as to leave *a King*, and be ſubject to *a Iacke ſtraw*? And is *ſtupiditie the Engliſh diſpoſition*, that can ſwallow any deceites, and abuſes, though never ſo palpaple? Doubtles whoever lookes, what Government was heeretofor lived vnder, & what now, muſt needes conclude, that ſuch, as willingly forſooke the on, and ſubmitted to the other, expeſſed as *low dejection, and debaſement of minde*, as ever the *Engliſh nation* ſhewed *fortitude* and *the many* ſufferers for refuſing their ſubmiſſion to this vſurpation, and *the few*, which the Author ſayes retaine the old Engliſh fortitude ſhewes, that it is not *the diſpoſition of an Engliſhman*, but the vnnaturall, and de-

generate inclinations of ſome, that aſſuminge the *Engliſh* name have ſought to diſhonour the nation, and transferre the infamy of their Actions on the *naturall diſpoſition, ſtiling the greateſt Traytours the beſt Engliſhmen.*

The firſt of his cauſes, whereto he aſcribes this low dejection, he ſayes *is to the Prelates, and their fellow teachers, though of another name, and ſect, whoſe pulpitt ſtuffe both firſt, and laſt hath been the doctrine, and perpetuall infuſion of ſervilitie, and wretchednes to all the hearers.*

Could the *Prelates*, and their *fellow teachers*, againſt whome not preachinge was cheifely objected by theſe Hipocrites, worke ſuch Miracles by their *pulpitt ſtuffe.* And could thoſe, whome they have excluded pulpits, for ſoe many yeares cauſe this new *degeneration*, of whoſe cauſes he ſeemes ſoe inquiſitive. Pulpitt ſtuffe was a Terme only proper to their ſhuffling Levites; which was an infuſion of contempt of the perſons, and detraction of the authoritie of their Rulers. How full were pulpitts, and Tubbs of theſe froggs, and vermin, Emiſſaries of hell, who decryed Chriſtian patience, and allowed noe fortitude, but what reſiſted Authoritie. The preaching of the *Prelates* in England will remaine to their honour, and the infamy of theſe *hipocriticall Rebells*, and *their workes follow them*, which ſchismaticall Lunacie vainely rages to defame, and all men can wittnes, that the ridiculous, and impertinent repetitions, vaine, and ſenſe leſſe inferences, the common pulpitt ſtuffe of *puritan Sectaries* made *preaching* to many, *as Elies ſons made the offerings of the Lord;* And the Rebellion, perjury, and Atheiſme, that hath followed ſuch ſermonizers, ſhewes what ſpirit they are of, and that they waite on *Ieroboams Calves*, leaſt men ſhould *returne to God*, and their *lawfull King*, but this rayling

ling at the *Prelates* is growne ſtale. The *ſervilitie*, and *wretchednes* he meanes, wee ſhall know more plainely heereafter, for *obedience*, & *ſufferinge* are the *ſervilitie* and *wretchednes*, which he calls the *pulpit ſtuffe of the Prelates*. Wee may ſhortly expect, that as theis miſcreants have altered ſtate, & Church, ſoe they will compoſe an *Index expurgatorius of the Bible*, for it cannot be imagined, that they will object this hainous Cryme of preaching *paſſive obedience* to the *Prelates*, and leave ſoe many places in the *Goſpell*, which commaund it, & themſelves neede not the *Goſpell* to make men obedient, they have the *ſword*, and this *Ceremony* of *Religion* is aboliſhed.

But what are theſe *fellow teachers of the Prelates of another name, and ſect?* why did he not ſpeake out, and name the *Preſbiterian?* was it not as eaſie to name him, as deſcribe him? ſuch termes are long in comming foorth, that carry with them the reproach of the ſpeaker. The common guilt, wherein theiſe ſects, and parties were involved appeares in their diviſion, and how they deceived the people, and one another. Its happy, if any men, that have gone farr in an evill way ſtopp, and returne to the right path. *St. Paul* gloried, that men ſaid of him, that he now preacht the faith, which before he deſtroyed, & if there be any, though of another name, and ſect in the ſenſe of this author, that preach loyaltie, which before they deſtroyed, Its Gods greate mercy to them, and that they reduce others from the errours of their way. Theſe Preſbiterians may hence obſerve, how vnhappily they were engaged againſt the *Prelates*, and with this other ſect in ſettinge foorth contumelious, & ſcoffing libells, that now have the ſame language caſt on themſelves by theiſe brethren in evill. Schiſme, & Rebellion have noe meane,

and

and he is much deceived, that thinkes to retaine either of them in any bounds without force, and this the *Preſbiterian* now findes to his loſſe, who is growne as contemptible to thoſe he meant to rule, as he endeavoured to make the *Prelates*.

Beſides their *pulpit ſtuffe* he ſayes *their lives the Tipe of all worldlines, and hipocriſie without the leaſt true patterne of vertue, righteouſnes, or ſelfe denyall in their whole practice.*

Of thoſe Markes, which the Scripture gives for the Tryall of *Hipocrites*, what one doe theſe Rebells want, their pride in aſſuming holines to themſelves, & denying it to others, is held foorth by them on all occaſions. *Stand further from me, I am holier, then thou*, was the old Jew, and *Lord I thanke thee I am not, as other men, nor as this Publican* was the reformed Phariſee, & how impiouſly theſe Traytours appropriate to themſelves righteouſnes, and ſelfe denyall, as if none, but Traytours could attaine the kuowledge of ſuch graces? If *righteouſnes* conſiſt in *Blaſpheming God, contempt of his ordinances*, and *ſcorning the doctrine*, and *practice* of his *ſaints*, theſe men may lay ſome claime to it, And if ſuch, as *deny* not themſelves the lives, and Eſtates of others, that *deny* not themſelves any power, or pleaſure they like, be the true *ſelfe denyers*, we cannot exclude this Author, and his Maſters from attaining it? Doe theſe men imagine, that vſing the termes of *righteouſnes*, and *ſelfe denyall*, which they have made much in faſhion, induces any man to thinke they eſteeme it, whoſe whole endeavours are *ſelfe ſeeking*? Can they perſwade any man, that when our bleſſed ſaviour would pay Tribute, though not due from him, that he might not give offence, that the *righteouſnes*, which he commended to his ſervants was not only to deny Tribute, but to fight againſt

againſt thoſe to whome it was due? Are they greater practiſers of *ſelfe deniall*, that preach warr, and blood rather, then obey, then thoſe, that preach *paſſive obedience*, and *ſuffering* rather then *violence?* Certenly the Alcaron Religion of theſe men, cannot entitle them to that *Evangelycall vertue of ſelfe deniall*, and their Actions being ſoe oppoſite to it, theit frequent vſe of the word proves their confirmed hipocriſie, & reſolved impenitencie. He may well wonder, if ſuch *pulpit ſtuffe*, and ſuch lives, as he mentions ſhould attract ſoe many from his old *Engliſh fortitude*. If he would have aſſigned a cauſe for ſuch an eminent change, as he ſuppoſes, it ſhould have been ſome way proportionable to the effect, and his beſt way had been to have advanced the knowledge, and ſubtile behaviour of the *Prelates*, and their fellow teachers, but madd men only will beleive him, when he ſayes men groſſe in their doctrines, and offenfive in their lives perſwaded the moſt part from the olde *Engliſh fortitude*, this ſhewes only a will to rayle, not ane Argument to prove. It wilbe an hard taſke for him to prove men the Tipe of worldlines, whome his Maſters have ſtript of all worldly meanes of living, and expoſed them, and their families to begg, or ſtarve. Was there ever a time in any one Kingdome, when ſoe many have endured the ſpoyling of their goods, & vndergone ſoe greate povertie from plentie, rather then renounce their faith, & former profeſſion, as the *Prelates of England*, and their *follow tachers? hipocriſie*, and *worldlines* conſiſt not with that condition, and in this Eſtate they cannot charge the *Prelates* with rayling, & virulent language againſt their perſecutors, as the Rebell Miniſters vſed againſt their Governours.

The people now diſcerne the difference betweene

the *Prelates* humilitie, and the pride of their preſent Impoſters, and that pride is leſſe incident to juſt Titles, then vſurpations, and that popular inſinuations never want ambition, and arrogance. The Biſhopps eminent vertues, and ſufferings are ſoe conſpicuous to all men, as cannot be obſcured by malicious detraction. But ſuch, as make it their ſin to preach *paſſive obedience* will judge Martirdome hipocriſie, and patience worldlineſſe.

His next cauſe he attributes to the *factious inclination of moſt men divided from the publique by ſerveral ends, and humours of their owne.*

Factious inclinations carry men to Rebellion, and diſobedience, and private ends divided from the publique are excentrique to lawfull Government. All changes proceede from theſe ends, and humours, and ſubmiſſion to Rulers is inconſiſtent with them. But the Author will have the reſiſtance of parricide, and Rebellion an effect of factious inclination, as patience, and paſſive obedience to be a worldly doctrine; By his account Rebells only have care of the publique, and all that oppoſe them have ends divided from it. This humour of ſeditious Traytours hath been anciently diſcovered, and yet by the peoples vnhappy credulitie never prevented, & thence it comes, that they complaine of faction, and innovation, while they are buſie in contrivinge it. And it is noe wonder, that they, that have found ſoe many deceived by their diſſembled paſſions, will offer ſuch palpable abſurdities to the people, that men oppoſe them for private ends, & that themſelves ſeeke only the publique, whē by blood, and rapine they have got poſſeſſion of all the wealth, & power of the Kingdome, and treade all vnder foote, that had right to rule They ſay truly they ſeeke the publique,

que, but all men ſee it is for their private ends, and ambition.

At firſt noe man leſſe beloved, noe man more generally condemned, then was the King from the time, that it became his Cuſtome to breake Parliaments at home, and eyther willfully, or weakely betray proteſtants abroade to the beginninge of thoſe combuſtions.

He would prove the people inconſtant, who doubts it? there hath been proofe enough of it in their wretched levitie toſſed to, and fro by theſe Rebells. Bene facere, male audire Regium eſt, will not be denyed by Iconoclaſtes to be a knowne truth, and that it is the common lot of good Princes to be miſreported. That his late Majeſt: ſuffered by the privy whiſpes of ambitious ſeducers to the credulous vulgar is eaſily graunted, but it was their ingratitude, not his merit, and the Authors *leſſe beloved and more generally condemned* is a ſuppoſition voyde, of truth, as the Act it ſelfe was voyde of dutie, the cauſes he would have to be *his Cuſtome in breaking Parliaments, and betraying Proteſtants.* Let vs examine what ground there was, for this averſion from the King vpon either of theis. There were in the time of King James, men, that made ill vſe of Parliaments, and inſteede of amending what was amiſſe ſtrived to make the people beleive things were out of order, which they felt not, and to create diſcontents at the Government. This cauſed the breach of ſome Parliaments in that Kings time, his late Majeſt: finding the people poſſeſt with greate jealoſies of his match with ſpaine, & greate deſires to breake the peace with that nation in order to the recovery of the Palatinate became the inſtrument of ſetling a right vnderſtandinge betweene the King, and his Parliament in the

21.th. Yeare of his Raigne. Then was the Treatie of the match, and peace broken, the ſeſſion of Parliament concluded to the greate joy of the people, and with their greate profeſſions of affection to his late Majeſt: for ſoe happy a worke. King James was noe ſooner dead, and his late Majeſt: by the Councell of the Parliament engaged in a dangerous warr, but the ſeditious contrivers, that had pretended ſuch Zeale for the regaininge of the Palatinate, caſt about how they might ruine his Majeſt: by that vndertaking, and in his firſt Parliament without reſpect to their owne promiſes, his Majeſt: merit from them in procuringe their deſires, or the publique neceſſities ingratefully withdrew their aſſistance from him, and ſpread abroade rumours againſt his Government, and when he called a Parliament, the private annimoſities, & perſonall thirſt of revenge in ſome men were entertained in the houſe of Commons, to exclude the conſideration of the preſſing neceſſities of his Majeſt: affaires, and forreigne agents had their fingers with theſe leaders in Parliament, to divert all ſupplies from his Majeſt: that both Proteſtants, and all other his allies might be diſappointed, and which by that meanes was effected. Its well knowne with what induſtrie, & difficultie his Majeſt: in the middeſt of his neceſſities advanct releife to the Proteſtants, and if they were betrayed, the Treaſon muſt lie on the Parliaments credulitie to thoſe vnderminers, that forſooke their King in the proſecution of that worke.

To *betray Proteſtants*, theis Traytours know ſignifies much to the people, & therefore they make it a reproach to their King againſt the knowne evidence of the fact, and all ſenſe, and though they hipocritically pretend affection to the *Proteſtant Religion*, the world knowes, they doe

doe not aſmuch, as give it a *toleration*, for the *Proteſtants* doe not account *Iohn of Leidon, and the mad men of Munſters Proteſtants*, & there is noe Religion, but theirs, now current in England.

This Author ſees the cleerenes of the proofe againſt their malitious allegations of *betraying Proteſtants*, and therefore deſcends a little in his termes, and ſayes either *wilfully, or weakely*. Could he betray them by impotencie of force, or Councell? thats a new found Treaſon, that the minde intends not, but its too much reſpect to ſuch an abſurd Calumnie to give it an anſweare.

He goes on, *all men inveighed againſt him, all men except Court vaſſalls oppoſed him, and his Tyranicall proceedings.*

Inveighinge againſt the King was vnknowne in England before ſuch Monſters, as this Author were hatcht by Rebellion, and made their words accord with their Actions, when their lying, and hipocriſie could noe longer ſerve turne. Before this time malecontents muttered their cenſures of Government, and people that beleived them, thought it their ſin, and ſhame to inveigh againſt their King. Though diſcontents were nouriſht among many, few, or none were ſoe impudent to inveigh. There is noe Courtier, whoſe obſervance to his Prince, or his flatterie of him can binde him to like vaſſallage, as he is, that ſerves Rebells by falſe, and impudent detractions of Rulers. Noe ſlave ſoe baſe, as he, that wilbe hired to murther the fame, and honour of others. There are ſome Courtiers among his new Maſters, whoſe falſhood to their true Maſter, and baſe obſervance of the Traytours to him entitles them to the worſt of vaſſallage. This Author goes an ill way to prove Tyranicall proceedings, when he ſayes they were ſoe oppoſed. Its ſtrange a Ty-

rant ſhould ſuffer himſelfe to be oppoſed, and how were thoſe Tyranicall proceedings oppoſed? he will ſay by diſputes in Courts of Juſtice, & was this Tyrany to admit conteſtations in ordinary Courts? There was never time, wherein there were not queſtions of right betweene King, and ſubject, & is it Tyrany in a Prince to be a partie in a Proces? And doth this Author hold malicious reports, and rumours notes of diſgrace vpon King, or any other Magiſtrate? good Princes lives confute detractours, and though the people for a time may be deluded, they will come to know a good King in his loſſe. Rebellious humours are an Epidemicall peſtilence, whoſe violence cannot continue.

This full Parliament was at firſt vnanimous in their diſlike, and proteſtation againſt his evill Government.

This hath not the leaſt colour of truth, and as there was never time, wherien ſomethinge was not to be amended, ſoe in the beginninge of this *Parliament*, there were things of that nature, but not ſuch, as laid Cryme vpon his Majeſt: Government, nor did the Parliament judge ſoe, but all corruptions of Courts, Errours of Councell, ill ſucceſſes of Actions are charged by this Author, as his Majeſt: ill Government, and every judgment of *Parliament* in a particular caſe made a *proteſtation* againſt it.

This Author cannot, but know, that the moſt *vnanimous proteſtation*, that ever the Parliament made was to defend the Kings perſon, honour, and Eſtate, and they, that made this *proteſtation* could not be *vnanimous in proteſting* againſt his evill Government, nor in deſtroying both him, and it. They proteſted to defend the lawes of the land, one of which they declared to be, *that the King could doe noe wrong, and that if they ſhould ſay his late Majeſt: did,*

did, they ſhould ſpeake againſt the law, & the affection of their owne hearts. Can this Author finde any roome heere for an *vnanimous proteſtation of the Parliament againſt the Kings ill Government.* And yet theſe were made long after the beginninge of the Parliament, but they, that have noe conſcience of ſpeaking truth, have noe ſhame to be convinced of falſhood.

But when they, who ſought themſelves, and not the publique began to doubt, that all of them could not by one, and the ſame way attaine to their ambitious purpoſes, then was the King, or his name at leaſt, as a fit propertie firſt made vſe of, his doings made the beſt of, and by degrees juſtified.

He is very induſtrious to finde out cauſes, why ſoe many would not be Traytours, why could he not fall into the conſideration of the oaths of Alleagiance, & ſupremacie, that all members of Parliament take at their entrance? why could he not thinke on the proteſtation themſelves contrived to defend the King? how did he forget the Commaunds of obedience from God? If himſelfe, and his Maſters had not preferred their ambitious ends before their dutie to God, or man, if they had not thought all oaths, and vowes of noe obligation againſt their ends, they would never have attributed other mens deſertion of their courſes to proceede from *ambitious ends*, Could men, that ſaw theſe Traytours making ſuch oaths, and proteſtations of loyaltie with a reſolution to breake them, run without remorſe with them? Could any, that retained any ſparke of Religion, or morall honeſtie concurr with ſuch perſons in their lewde courſes? But all could not attaine their *ambitious ends* by the *ſame way*. *What way?* by deſtroying the King? wee are ſure ſome have attained their *ambitious ends that way*. And doth

doth this Author thinke, that any men had higher *ends of ambition*, then they, that now have attained theirs? if he doe, he hath very few of his minde, how ever there was *a way to ambitious ends*, but it was not wide enough for all, and who had theſe *ambitious ends* they, that tooke the way, or they, that left it. They that had obligations of honour, and conſcience for their wayes are vncharitably charged with *ambitious ends*, and they, that brake the bounds of dutie, and oaths to attaine their ends, are ſottiſhly pretended to ſeeke the publique.

How the Kings name, and office hath been made a propertie, and all dutie, and oaths to him a Ceremony by the Traytours is knowne to the world. They have not ſpared any thing Religious, or Civill. They have made a propertie of the very name of God, of faſts, of thankesgiving, of prayers, of preaching. They have made a propertie of Juſtice, of Delinquents, evill Councellours? how often have they made the lords houſe a propertie calling it the Kings hereditary Councell? how often of loyaltie? Aud how frequently in this very libell doth he make a propertie of the name of Parliament. All men ſee there hath been nothing reall with them, but their ambition, and crueltie.

Which begate him ſuch a partie, as after many wiles, and ſtruglings with his inward feares imboldened him at length to ſet vp his ſtandard againſt the Parliament.

After many Meſſages to the Traytours, that poſſeſt both houſes of Parliament. After many offers to relinquiſh his juſt rights to take away all jealoſies, and feares of his power, which were then pretended. After many Remoſtrances, of the Calamities, that attend Civill diſtractions. After the vndutiful rejections of al his motions

for

for peace. After the diſcovery of the vnſatiable ambition, and blood thirſtie malice of the prevailing partie. After the violation of all priviledges of Parliament. After the compulſion of the better part of both houſes to deſert them. After the ſeizing of his Majeſt: forts, and Navy, and aſſuminge the Militia. After the longeſt, and moſt provokt patience, that ever King reteined, his Majeſt: ſet vp his ſtandard againſt thoſe Rebells, that tooke the name of Parliament.

But Iconoclaſtes remember, you have heere vpbraided feares to the King, when you come to deny he had any. What wiles were vſed to ſeduce the people, what jealoſies, & ridiculous feares were blowne vp to diſorder them is yet freſh in Memory, and he well obſerves the Kings ſtandard at length ſet vp, for there was juſt cauſe to have done it long before, and much diſadvantage to his Majeſt: by the delay.

When as before that time, all his adherents conſiſtinge moſt of diſſolute ſwordmen, and ſuburb royſters hardly amounted to the making vp of one ragged Regiment ſtrong enough to aſſault the vnarmed houſe of Commons.

What time doth he meane the ſetting vp of the ſtandard? If his Majeſt: had ſooner declared againſt the Traytours, he had not wanted a greater *Regiment*. And if he had intended to aſſault the *houſe of Commons*, thoſe he had with him were enough to have done it, though thoſe, that then ſate had been *armed*, otherwiſe thoſe members would not have been abſent, when he came.

For the qualitie of the Kings adherents, as he Phraſes it, the perſons, that then waited on him were for the moſt part of better qualitie, then their Rebell Generall, whome now they adore. It was the art of one of the guides of

this Treaſon at that time to ſtile ſuch, as were about the King *Cavileers*, as a name vnagreeable to the *prickeard Puritan*, whoſe ſuperſilious demurenes made wry faces at ſuch a name, it being the Cuſtome of falſe Traytours to lay claime to thoſe behaviours, that may hide their inward wolviſh diſpoſition, and defame others to get reputation to themſelves, and thence *ſuburb Royſters*, and *diſſolute ſwordmen* became names for ſuch, as followed the King to add terrour to the citizens of London, who have found more pride, crueltie, & robbery among their ſchismaticall pretenders to pietie, then any ſuch danger, as was threatned them from ſuch, as followed the King.

Though this breaker would deſtroy the reaſon, and ſenſe of his readers, yet its impoſſible by ſuch incoherent Arguments, as he produceth. Can he hope any man will beleive him, that ſuch, as followed the King at that time to the lower houſe, were all, that tooke offence at the proceedings in Parliament, and that none els were reſolved to aſſiſt the King againſt the inivries offred him? That were too vnreaſonable conſidering the Actions both then, and ſucceedinge, and becauſe he had not endeavoured to get more ſtrength, therefore he could not? But if the number of them, that had a right vnderſtanding of the Kings affaires were very ſmall, doth it follow, that the contrary was the better becauſe numerous? The Author refutes it himſelfe in his next words, and ſurely the Argument is more ſtrong againſt the cauſe he maintaines, that the people, that at firſt followed them have now left them, then the motions of the people carryed by rumours againſt their King in the beginning were of any Tyrany, or ill Government in him, for a people are eaſier ſtirred vp to follow an evill cauſe, then reduced af-

ter

ter they have begun, and the qualitie,& number of ſuch perſons, who have loſt their lives, and fortunes in maintaning the Kings cauſe in regard of Eſtate, honour, and integritie, & in Compariſon of ſuch, as Rebelled againſt him, might juſtly have withheld this Authors hand from objecting againſt their condition, for his owne partie muſt admire his impudence having ſuch evidence of the fact.

After which attempt ſeconded by a tedious, and bloody warr on his ſubjects, wherein he hath ſoe farr exceeded thoſe his arbitrary violences in time of peace, they, who before hated him for his miſgovernment, nay fought againſt him with diſplayed Banners in the field, now applaud him, & extoll him for the wiſeſt, and moſt Religious Prince, that lived.

And let Iconoclaſtes ſhew other reaſon of this change, then the evidence of their former miſtake. Could it be *ambitious ends*, that made men extoll him, whome they had offended, and that after his impriſonment, and murther. After the defeate of his forces,& noe expectation, but of oppreſſion vpon all ſuch, as expreſſed a good opinion of him ? ſurely he hath abundantly requited his ſcornefull expreſſion of his late Majeſt: ragged Regiment in the beginning, that heere tells vs after all his loſſes, and loweſt condition, nay after death his very Enemies changed their thoughts of him. *Repentance* is a greate reproach among thoſe Rebells, the preaching of that doctrine is worſe to them, then *paſſive obedience*. That there were ſome, that hated his Majeſt: may be beleived, their tongues, and pens ſet on fire of hell have publiſhed it to the world. They that hate Chriſtian vertues, hate ſuch, as have them. They, that hate the ordinances of God, hate ſuch, as are appointed to exerciſe them, But it

was only in ſome fiery ſchiſmatickes; whoſe pride diſguiſed with profeſſion of humilitie, at firſt appeared in their petulancy againſt their teachers, and at laſt came to exalt it ſelfe above all, that is called God. Theſe men perfectly hated the King, that hated all Government, and by this meaſure Iconoclaſtes would comprehend all ſuch, as through credulitie, or errour at firſt fell into this misfortune to beare Armes againſt their King. Doubtles they, that after this tedious, and bloody warr became more affectionate to his Majeſt: deſcerned not ſuch exceſſes on his Majeſt: part, as this Author ſuppoſes, for that had not been an Argument for a change. Its manifeſt to all, that his Majeſt: Actions in this warr were noe other, then ſuch, as the neceſſitie of that condition drawes with it, and which the nobleſt Enemies vſe, & his Enemies cannot produce one Act done by him, which themſelves did not avow, and yet he ſayes in the warr he exceeded his Arbitrary violences in time of peace, and if wee take the word of Iconoclaſtes, they were not irregular, that the neceſſary Actions of warr did exceede, and by the way neither Iconoclaſtes, nor his Maſters for their juſtification have produced one Act of Arbitrary violence againſt his late Majeſt: though they make outcryes of Tyrany, and violence to hide the vglines of their villany.

By ſoe ſtrange a Method amongst the madd multitude is a ſudden reputation won of wiſedome by willfullnes, and ſubtill ſhifts. Of goodnes by multiplying evill. Of pietie by endeavouring to roote out true Religion.

But is it only the *multitude* he meanes, in whome this ſtrange *change* is? that cannot be, for the ſevere proceedings of his Maſters againſt eminent perſons for deſerting their ſide, their purging the Parliament, as they call it, & this

this Authors ſucceeding diſcourſe denote others, beſides the *madd multitude*. Its a ſtrange Method, that the *madd multitude* ſhould be moved to honour ſuffering vertue, which themſelves had perſecuted; were not the evidences without exception? And its not ſtrange, that ſuch, as knew not the King, but by the ſly inſinuations of ſeducers, ſhould come to the knowledge of their Errours by his eminent vertues in his ſufferings. The Method, that Iconoclaſtes calls ſtrange, is certainely as ſtrange, as the Method he takes to be beleived, for will any man give him credit, that after ſuch an averſion, as he mentions in the people from the King vpon the pretence of his imprudence, and vnſoundnes in Religion, the people ſhould be drawne to an opinion of his *wiſedome by willfullnes. Of goodnes by multiplying evill. Of pietie by endeavouring to roote out true Religion.* Though the people were deceived in his late Majeſt: yet take them at the worſt, if they had hated him, becauſe they thought him evill, they would not be drawne to love him, becauſe they found him ſoe. Its not ſtrange, that the *multitude* finding themſelves cheated ſhould be aſhamed of their errour, and among other ſeducements, that cry of rooting out Religion made lowdeſt noyſe in the beginning of this Rebellion, and this Author, and his fellowes have vndeceived the people, for they *have rooted out all Religion*, and left nothing, that hath the face of it. Did the people expect, that all the cry, that was made of Religion was to bring in Arrianiſme, Anabaptiſme, Socinianiſme, & ſuch ſects, as they never heard of? was this the Religion they intended to fight for? Its not ſtrange at all, that the *mad multitude*, who were inflamed with the reputation, and Authoritie of the Parliament comminge to ſee, that the

orders, votes, & other Trumperie, with which they were led on, were only the contrivance of a factious crew, ſhould abhorre them. That comminge to ſee the abolition of Parliaments, and ſcorne of the peoples Power, which at firſt was preached to them over their King, they ſhould bewayle their owne miſerie, that was ſoe vnhappily brought on them by their owne precipitation. The proofes of his late Majeſt: wiſedome, goodnes, and pietie are obvious to the meaneſt capacitie, and the ſublimeſt vnderſtandings have made his vertues, aſwell, as his misfortunes their wonder, and though wee have lived in an age, where prodigies of villany are every day acted, this Author is a wonder to wiſemen, that makes a Method of lying, and diſſimulation: But as the Government of hell is confuſion, ſoe are the Arts and Method of the Miniſters of that Enemy of mankinde, which confound reaſon, and ſobrietie, and ſoe, as they may contradict truth, care not to contradict themſelves.

But it is evident, that the cheife of his adherents, never loved him, never honoured him, nor his cauſe, but as they tooke him to ſett a face vpon their owne malignant deſignes, nor bemoane, his loſſe at all, but the loſſe of their owne aſpiring hopes.

Its evident the Author ſayes it, and evident, that it is without ground, or colour of truth. would men, that never loved him, never honoured him, nor his cauſe, not only hazard, but looſe thier lyues, & fortunes in defence of him, and his cauſe, and that when the beſt ſucceſſes they could hope for, could not equall the perils they ran? If there be either honour, or gallantry in any of thoſe, that call themſelves ſouldiers, & Enemies to their King, and that Rebeilion hath not vnnaturalized them, they would hate ſuch an impudent Paraſite, that ſeekes to pleaſe

pleaſe them with ſuch impotent Calumines of perſons (whoſe worth, and honour they have ſoe often tryed) becauſe they were Enemies to his partie. What Malignant deſignes would he have imagined, ſuch, as noe man ever dreamt of? Doth not this man beleive, that his readers ſee, he followes the common places of detraction without reſpect to the proprietie of perſons, or Actions? May not this language, that he vſed of any perſons, that follow a partie? was there ever in the world an Example of a cauſe proſecuted vpon more diſadvantage on behalfe of the Kings partie?

When a King is proſecuted by his ſubjects, Iconoclaſtes tells vs they that adheare to him doe it for *malignant deſignes*. Its certaine the Rebells had noe other, but wicked, and *malignant deſignes*, and whence came malignant deſignes in ſuch, as oppoſed them? Becauſe they Rebelled, other men had malignant deſignes, and if any had malignant Deſignes, & ſecrett diſaffections to the King, or his cauſe, doth he thinke it adds any weight to his ſlanders againſt the King? will he lay on him the faults of his partie? It ſeemes he thought ſome *madder*, then the *multitude* would reade his booke, otherwiſe ſuch traſh would not have been worth his binding vp, but he tooke this to make vſe of his Greeke, how the Captive women ſeemed to lament Patroclus, though in truth their owne condition, and thats the beſt of his evidence for this aſſertion, and therefore he notes the booke, where it is.

It muſt needes be ridiculous to any judgement vninthrald, that they, who in other matters expreſſe ſoe little feare either of God, or man, ſhould in this one particular outſtrip all Preciſianiſme with their Scruples, & fill mens eares continually with the noyſe of conſcientious loyaltie,

tie, and Alleagiance to the King, Rebells in the meane while to God in all their Actions beſides.

It is ridiculous to any judgement vninthrald, that ſuch, as Rebell againſt their King ſhould pretend they are not Rebells to God, and that ſuch, as profeſſe Preciſianiſme in crying downe dances, and May-games ſhould expect to be beleived, that they feare God, or man, when in the meanetime they violate all oaths, and duty to God, and man. Have not this generatiõ ſhewed to the world, that all their outward formalities were noe other, then the waſhing cleane of the outſide of the veſſell? Are ſuch fitt judges of conſcience, that pretended this Preciſianiſme he mentions, who made greate ſcruples, and caſes touching Ceremonies, and make noe bones of robbery, murther, and Rebellion? It was our ſaviours judgement, that they which neglected the greater matters of the law were moſt properly Hipocrites. Notwithſtanding their Preciſianiſme, that all men of any partie, or ſocietie ſhould be free from ſcandalous offences, where there are multitudes is without Example, and it could not be hoped in the beſt, and cleereſt cauſe, that all, that followed it ſhould have ſincere ends, but none could have leſſe feare of God, or man, then he, that would make all guiltie of the Crymes of ſome, that for particular crymes of men will take the Devills office to accuſe all their Actions. He makes it not in among the number of ſcruples, & caſes, whether Rebellion be a ſin, but holds it a cleere caſe to be none? And then why not Idolatry, adulterie, and what not? Its poſſible, & probable to any judgment vninthrald, that ſome men may make ſcruples of ſome ſins, & are peccant in diverſe others, and its farr from ridiculous, that mẽ have greateſt remorſe of ſins, the greatnes

nes of whoſe guilt it moſt evident to their conſciences. But this Author doth not love the noyſe of *conſciencious loyaltie*, & had rather noe *conſcience* then any *loyaltie*. The particular Crymes of ſome, that followed his Majeſt: cauſe, and made warr againſt him by their ſins have been lamented, and reproved out of Chriſtian zeale, not hipocriticall auſteritie, nor can any judgement from thence draw any concluſion againſt the cauſe they have followed, nor convince them of ſiniſter ends in following it.

But is not a Rebell to his King a Rebell to God? The preachers among thoſe Rebells have had a long heart riſing againſt their Rulers, & to take men off from being tender in Rebellion againſt their King, when ever they reproved any ſin that terme of *Rebellion againſt God* came with it, inſinuating a diſtinction of Rebellion againſt Princes, from *Rebellion againſt God*, yet Rebellion againſt Princes is a ſin againſt God, & they cannot free themſelves of the greateſt guilt of ſin, that ſeduce men into it, & handle the word of God deceitefullie, & ſuch, as open a gate to Rebellion againſt Princes by transferring the Terme from the moſt ordinary ſignification, and applying it wholy to the borrowed ſenſe, ſeeke to get ſlaves to hell, not ſaints to heaven: Theſe were the infuſions of their ordinary lecturers, and ſerves aptly for the Rebell Politiques.

Much leſſe, that they, whoſe profeſſed loyaltie, and Alleagiance led them to direct Armes againſt the kings perſon, & thought him nothing violated by the ſword of hoſtilitie drawne by them againſt him, ſhould now in earneſt thinke him violated by the vnſparing ſword of Iuſtice.

What meanes he in this? Is it much leſſe ridiculous in theſe latter, then the former? The forme of his Period went, as if he meant to make a gradation to the greater, and I thinke he intended it, and an errour of the preſſe; for ſure nothing is more ridiculous, then to thinke the King nothing violated by the ſword of hoſtilitie, whome he meanes wee muſt gueſſe, for he

cannot name them, but by circumlocution. There is a greate difference betweene the *ſword of Rebellion*, and *the ſword of hoſtilitie*, & betweene the ſword of lawles violence, & the ſword of juſtice, & Chriſtians never thought, that any ſword drawne by ſubjects againſt their King did not violate their loyaltie, & Alleagiance, much leſſe, that their profeſſed loyaltie, and Alleagiance led them to direct Armes againſt the Kings perſon: If loyaltie leade to hoſtilitie, it were an ill foundation of obedience. Truth is not leſſe wounded by lying, then loyaltie by Armes againſt the King. Some doubtles foreſaw not the conſequents of their beginnings, and being deceived by wrong principles fel into vnhappy concluſions, which they ſuſpected not to follow from their premiſſes, but as they are deceived, that wil ſever abſurd concluſions from erroneous premiſſes, ſo are they, that wil hope to avoyde deſperate conſequents from ill grounded Actions.

Doth Iconoclaſtes hold it neceſſary, that al they, that have fallen into an impietie, muſt be impenitent, and becauſe they have been ſinners, muſt they become Blaſphemers, and Apoſtats? There have beene Examples of many Rebells, that yet abhord the ſhedding of their Kings blood. But Iconoclaſtes holds it a dishonour to be a ſmal villaine, & he that wilbe wicked muſt act Crymes of the higheſt degree, & if he faile in the laſt Act, he muſt be thruſt from the ſtage. The more impious the Actions of Traytours are, the more evident the guilt of them, the greater prayſes they give them, and moſt magnifie that, which is moſt abominable, & they ſtile their moſt outragious crueltie *vnſparing Iuſtice*. As they will ſpare noe mans blood to paſſe to their ends; ſoe they wil not be ſparing in the Titles of their villanies; If this ſhameles man had not been ſenſible of the vinverſall deteſtation of the fact, he mentions, & that it was acted in defiance of Religion, law, & Juſtice, he would never have choſē this expreſſiō of the *vnſparing ſword*

of

of Iuſtice. If Rebels may judge of Juſtice, the cleereſt Juſtice wil become the fowleſt Cryme, & the Juſtice that inflicts puniſhment on their Rebellion the greateſt Tyrany; Lawes are oppreſſion, where Malefactours have got the Tribunall. The *vnſparing ſword* of Rebellion will noe more appeare the ſword of Juſtice, then the *vnſparinge* virulency of a lewde tongue appeare a legall condemnation of a lawfull Magiſtrate. Is it *vnſparing Iuſtice*, that gives the ſword into every hand, that would kill, and reproachfull language into every *falſe tongue?* If there be offenders, they, that without authoritie take one them to puniſh, are more guiltie, then the offender: But wee may be aſſured, where Rebels, & vſurpers are Judges, innocence wilbe the greateſt Cryme, and horrid Murthers vnſparing Juſtice.

But he proceedes to ſay, *which vndoubtedly ſoe much the leſſe in vaine ſhee beares among men, by how much greater, and in higheſt place the offender.*

This neede explication. He ſpake but now of the *ſword of Iuſtice*, and now ſayes *ſhee beares*, this is ſome new ſpeculation. St. Paul ſayes the Magiſtrate beares not the ſword in vaine, and this man would have every man the Magiſtrate, and the ſword borne without an hand to ſtrike with it, & Juſtice executed by a Metaphor. He makes *Iuſtice* ſome wandring ſpirit, that inviſibly carries a ſword. Whence comes the ſentence of this *Iuſtice* from the mouth of the Cryminall, or the Judge? for by thoſe motions both may lay equall claime to it, & becauſe juſtice ought to be adminiſtrated impartially, ſuch, as are in higheſt place, & from whome alone the adminiſtration of Juſtice is derived to all others muſt be murthered by thoſe that are ſubject to them? Juſtice hath noe ſword, but the power of the lawfull Magiſtrate, which is called the ſword of Juſtice from the Magiſtrates duty, & becomes the ſword of violence, & murther in the hands of another, but theis men thinke they may vſe the ſword without a calling as preach, and adminiſter

the Sacraments vncalled. Would Iconoclaſtes be content, that the Bayliffe of weſtminſter ſhould draw the impartiall ſword of Juſtice againſt his new Maſters, that are in higheſt place?

Els Iuſtice, whether morall, or politicall were not Iuſtice, but a falſe counterfeite of that impartiall, and godlike vertue.

Iuſtice cannot become *noe Iuſtice*, but the Acts of men may be juſt, or vnjuſt, as they follow, or forſake the Rules of *Iuſtice*. And what greater contempt of Juſtice, then to pretend it for the ruine of mankinde? What grater reproach to that *Godlike vertue*, then to proſtitute it to all the execrable Parricides of the world? Doth the Image breaker thinke, that having called it a *Godlike vertue*, he hath well defined it by King killing, for that is the ſenſe of his higheſt place? Its a part of his Method to inſinuate an opinion of his eſteeme of Juſtice by the prayſe of it, & that ſuch, as he oppoſes were leſſe Zealous of it, but his context ſhewes, that *Iuſtice* is defyed by him, and he ſeekes to waſh the bloody hands of the worſt of Traytours by caſting their odious acts on his *imaginary Iuſtice*. But whẽce comes Iconoclaſtes to aſſume the expreſſiõ of a *Godlike vertue*, and is ſoe angry with Iconbaſilice? Is there more warrant for his *Godlike vertue* of Juſtice, then for the *Godlike* office of Kings? And he is as much Iconoclaſtes of the one, as the other, for they, that will wreſt the ſword out of the hands of Gods vicegerents will not ſticke to wreſt that *Godlike vertue* to their owne impieties

The only greife is, that the head was not ſtrucke of to the beſt advantage, and commoditie of them that held it by the haire.

Doubtles they, that ſtruke it of did it for their owne *advantage, and commoditie* without reſpect to Juſtice, or feare of God, and ſure if ſome were greived, that it was not ſtrucke of to their *advantage*, they, that ſtrucke it of did it to that purpoſe, and to the ſatisfiction of their owne crueltie, and laying the foundation of their Tyrany, this followes from Iconoclaſtes

for

for that *commoditie*, which ſome had, and others miſſed cauſed the Murther. *They, that hold it by the haire, and they, that ſtrucke it of have cauſe of* greife, though Iconoclaſtes, and his Maſters, that have, as they thinke the *advantage, and Commoditie* of it, now laugh at their partners, whome they put by, and at the wickednes they acted, and himſelfe gives ſtronger evidence, that the ring-leaders of this horrid Rebellion ſought their owne *commoditie, and advantage*, then can be ſuppoſed of *Malignant deſignes* in any of his Majeſt: partie.

Which obſervation, though made by a common Enemy, may for the truth of it heereafter become a proverbe.

Wicked Actions are not the leſſe odious for Companie, and the obſervation, which it ſeemes he intends, that ſome of their partie, that now forſake them, were equally guiltie with them of the Kings death, will noe way excuſe them, that proceeded to that high degree of impietie. But why is the obſervator called a *common Enemy?* Why is he more an Enemy, then they, that reproach the preſent Murtherers, as much, as he? Their Enemies are now all man kinde, and ſuch, as beleived not their intentions, nor Actions cannot be deceived of them now they are defended by this Author. If that obſervation *become a proverbe*, will not the wickednes of theis Murtherers become a Proverbe to denote the greateſt degree of villany?

But as to the Author of thoſe ſoliloquies, where it were the late King, as is vulgarly beleived, or any ſecret Coadiutor, and ſome ſticke not to name him, it can add nothing, nor ſhall take from the weight (if any be) of reaſon, which he brings. How the Champion traverſes his ground. At firſt he looked with greate ſcorne to have ſuch an *Antagoniſt*, as a King, then he condeſcends *to take vp the gantlet*, then as an induction to his Trayterous reproaches craves excuſe for *not vſing Courtſhip*, & now he makes a doubt, whether the King, or ſome *coadiutor be Author of thoſe ſoliloquies*, and he ſayes *ſome ſticke not to name him.* Truly its noe ſecret, or

ſtrange thing, that there be not men wanting, that would not *ſticke* at any Action, or word againſt the King. Is it the neerer truth, when ſome ſticke not to name the man, when Iconoclaſtes *ſtickes* not at ſoe many vntruths? He, that reades this Authors booke will reſt aſſured, that he will *ſticke* at the affirmation of nothing, that may diſhonour his late Majeſt: But its ſtrange he thought his inſinuation of any weight, that ſome *ſticke* not to name him, when all men ſee the licence taken by ſo many lewde perſons, & noe reſtraint from ſaying any thing againſt the King, whereat ſhould they *ſticke*, their impudence is commended, and rewarded? Would they *ſticke* at truth, thats out of faſhion in the new ſtate? But perhapps they *ſticke* to name a man, leaſt they have a conviction from him, or ſome els, that could diſcover the Circumſtances about it. But ſince he makes a ſcruple, if there be not reaſon in the booke, why is he ſoe vnwilling to admit the King to be the Author, ſurely it were for his advantage to make the King author of ſuch a booke, and if they were a *Coadiutors*, why doth he lay his weakenes, or errours, as he pretends vpon the King. The Author doth not add, nor take away from the reaſon in the booke, but the booke commends the Author, and ſhames the anſweare.

But allegations, not reaſons are the maine contents of this booke, and neede noe more, then other contrary allegations to lay the queſtion before all men in an even ballance.

The allegations in his Majeſt: booke are either ſuch, as are only knowne to himſelfe, or ſuch, as were evident to all men by the light of reaſon, or notorietie of Actions. And Iconoclaſtes vainely flatters himſelfe, that his contrary allegations wilbe of any weight to move the ſcale. Sober men take his oſtentation of confidence rather as an effect of frenſy, then a perſwaſion of reaſon, But through his whole booke he offers allegations againſt apparent reaſons.

Though

Though it were ſuppoſed, that the Teſtimony of one man in his owne caſe affirminge, could be of any Moment to bring in doubt, the authoritie of a Parliament denying a contrary allegation againſt this, would weigh downe the ballance in moſt mens judgment.

The periûries, impoſtures, cruelties, & devaſtations of thoſe he calls the Parliament are ſoe knowne, & common abroade, that the mention of them is a name of infamy, and takes away all credit from their Actions. Their owne journalls tell the world, that they never ſpeake truth, but for their advantage, and omit noe falſhood, that will ſerve their turne. But doth Iconoclaſtes thinke any Parliament infallible, or that all men condemned by Parliament had Juſtice done them? He wil then finde, that they condemne one another, and for this laſt miſnamed Parliament, their bloody executions have ſuch apparent markes of Injuſtice, and crueltie, as themſelves cannot deny it, vnles they will deny the records themſelves have made, & the Teſtimony of former Parliaments. There are in his Majeſt: booke many particulars, that the Parliament neither did, nor could deny, and through the whole booke the Author hath produced few, or none of their denyalls. There hath been much vſe made of the name of Parliament, but the Author muſt thinke he hath an inchanting pen, if after the murther of the king, abolishing the Lords houſe, plucking out the members from the lower houſe, proſtituting the very conſtitution of Parliament to the lawleſſe multitude, and packing the Roome with a few meane perſons, eyther terrified by power, or flattered by promiſes, he can perſwade any, that ſuch a Company ſitting on the vſuall ſeates of the lower houſe be the Parliament, he may aswell give the name of Parliament to a Pariſh veſtry, as that Convention, all the odds is the place of their meetinge.

But if theſe his faire ſpoken words ſ halbe heere fairly confronted, and laid parallell to his owne farr differing deedes manifeſt, & viſible to the whole nation, then &c. His

His Majeſt: words he ſayes are *faire ſpoken*, and will appeare ſincere againſt al the fowle ſpokē words of this author to confront them; And his actions are ſoe wel knowne to the whole nation, as he doth in vaine appeale to them, as witneſſes of the truth of thoſe falſe, and incongruous Calumnies, that he hath produced. His Majeſt: Actions being laid parallell to this Authors different expreſſions ſhew the lewdnes of the Libellers impudence, that will appeale for the truth of what he ſayes to thoſe, that beſt know the contrary, and in a caſe, where the evidence of the fact excludes all appeale.

The Author concludes, *that wee may looke on them, who notwithſtandinge ſhall perſiſt to give to bare words more credit, then to open Actions, as men, whoſe judgment was not rationally evinced, & perſwaded, but fatally ſtupified, & bewitched into ſuch a blinde, and obſtinate beleife, for whoſe cure he ſayes it may be doubted, not whether any charme, though never ſoe wiſely murmured, but whether any prayer can be availeable.*

If after the reading of this Authors booke any man thinke him a modeſt man, that he hath dealt ingeniouſly with his Majeſt: booke, or perſon, he may be ſure, that ſuch a perſon were not *rationally evinced*, but eyther maliciouſly *prepoſſeſt*, or ſtupidly *infatuated*, and neither vnderſtood words, nor Actions, And this Author meanes not to cure, but to charme expreſſing his delight in the terme of *murmuringe*, which was the Cuſtome of witches in their *Charmes*, never vſed by ſervants of God, though wicked men are compared to the deafe adder, whoſe eare is ſtopped to the *murmuring Charmer*, as theirs to the holy advice. But Iconoclaſtes may aſwell hope to turne men into ſtones by his abſurd aſſertions, or into ſerpents by his lewde reproaches, as perſwade men of his reaſon, or honeſtie. We know the *prayers* of the wicked are abominable, aſwell, as their wilfull falhood, and ſlander, & while he ſeekes to place thoſe, that will not be led by him, among thoſe that *Charmes*, cannot cure, nor *prayers* profit, declares his *prayers*, noe other, then Charmes, and himſelfe a man, that can neither cure, nor pray, and ſets prayer among thoſe things he ſcoffes at, aſwell, as the Titles of him, that is only to be prayed to.

ΕΙΚΩΝ ΑΚΛΑΣΤΟΣ

Vpon the

KINGS

Calling this laſt

PARLIAMENT.

THat, which the King lajes downe, as his foundation, that he called this laſt Parliament not more by others advice, and the neceſſitie of his affaires, then by his owne choice, and inclination, is to all knowing men ſo apparently vntrue, that a more inauſpicious Sentence could hardly have come into his minde.

That his Majeſt: intention could be apparent to all knowing men, muſt have better Authoritie, then this Authors word to be beleived. His Majeſt beſt knew his own intentions, and ought to be credited againſt the Malicious conjectures of ſuch, as ſeeke matter of ſlander againſt him to ſhelter their owne impieties, never King of England ſhewed greater affection to Parliaments, then his Majeſt: and never King found greater ingratitude. His frequent coming to Parliaments in his Fathers Raigne. His many good offices done the houſes, and the larg acknowledgments of their obligations to him are vpon the Records of both houſes. Vpon the death of his Father he inſtantly called a Parliament, ſeeking to continue the ſame vnderſtanding betweene him, and his houſes, as there had been in the time of his Father. He had then entred into a dangerous warr with Spaine vpon the Parliaments Councell, was in preparation of a greate fleete, ſtood charged with a greate debt left on him by his Father, beſides deepe engagements to his Allies abroade, the ſupplies the then Parliament gave him were two Subſidies, he then deſired an addition

only of fortie thouſand pound, which was refuſed him. If any man ſhall ſay now, that the King called not that Parliament of his owne inclination, becauſe he was diſcontented to be ſo dealt with by them, knowing men wil hardly beleive him, & ſuch men, as are juſtly diſpleaſed with factions in Parliament, might truly affect them, when they are rightly diſpoſed, and this Sentence, which Iconoclaſtes holds ſo inauſpicious imports not that, which his falſe Augurie Prognoſticates, for though his Majeſt: received provocations, and cauſes of diſlike from ſeverall Parliaments, it followes not, that he could have no intention to call one, when there was a probabilitie of removing the cauſes of former diſorders, which his Majeſt: expreſſes in his enſuing diſcourſe.

The inclination of a Prince is beſt knowne by thoſe next about him, or by the current of his Actions. Theſe neereſt this King were Courtiers, and Prelates, and it was their Continuall exerciſe to diſpute, and preach againſt them.

For the Actions of others Iconoclaſtes would thinke them a weake proofe of his intentions, though the perſons were very neere him, and though there were preaching, and diſputes againſt the proceedings of ſome Parliaments, its no proofe of the Kings intentions, nor theirs, that vſed them againſt the right vſe of Parliaments, and the proceedings of ſome Parliaments might give juſt occaſion to men to ſay *the King (they hoped) would have no more neede of them* and it is a very greate happineſſe of any ſtate not to neede them, the neceſſitie of them proceeding from want, and danger, and there was a time, when people held Parliaments a burthen to hem, and thoſe in Parliament claimed it, that they were not bound to attend the Parliament above fortie dayes, and our owne ſtories tells vs of an *indoctum Parliamentum*, *and inſanum Parliamentum*. And doth Iconoclaſtes thinke, that all ſuch, as were out of love with ſuch Parlaments had no affection to any.

This was (he ſajes) *but the Coppy, which his Paraſites had induſtrioufly taken from his owne words, and Actions, who never called a Parliament, but to ſupply his neceſſities.*

Such, as have obſerved the inclinations of perſons neere his Majeſt: finde non greater Paraſites, then ſuch, as proved Traytours to him, and Paraſites are not wanting to other powers, as wel, as Kings, for we finde by this Author what men will do to pleaſe their Maſters eyther by officiouſnes to their perſons, or the performance of villanie againſt others. This Author ſpends his mouth in vaine following his common place of Paraſites, and Courtiers, when the Actions he mentions are ſo farr from reflecting vpon his Majeſt: as they leave the blemiſh vpon the Relatour. That his Majeſt: had neceſſities, when he called a Parliament is knowne to all, & the cauſes of them, but that he was ready all wayes to heare, and redreſſe the juſt greivances of his people could never yet be contradicted by the experience in any Parliament, al though the Author ſay, *having Supplied theſe, he ſuddenly, and nominiouſly diſſolved*

it

it without redreſſing any one greivance of the people. But if the Parliaments never preſented to him on greivance to be redreſſed, which he denyed, where lies the ignominie? It ſeemes the Author takes not the petition of right to be of that nature, for that was graunted by the King, and that conceſſion of his was then judged as greate an Act to the redreſſe of greivances, as ever King of England graunted his people. His Majeſt: ſummoned three Parliaments before the ſhort Parliament at the beginning of theſe troubles, and in non of theſe were there any greivances preſented by the Parliament to the King to be redreſſed, but that petition of right, vnles a Remonſtrance againſt the Duke of Buckingham be reckned in that number, and if the people, had juſt greivances to be redreſſed, they had juſt cauſe of complaint againſt thoſe Conventions, and of late repentance for their credulitie, that depended ſo much on them, that ſo little regarded their Sufferings. If we looke vpon the length of time, wherein theſe Parliaments ſate, wee ſhal finde ſeſſions concluded, & diverſe good lawes made in the like ſpace of time in the Raignes of former Kings, and whoever lookes to the journalls of the houſes in theſe Parliaments of his late Majeſt: or whoever was preſent in them muſt confeſſe, that thoſe, that governed in the lower houſe minded nothing leſſe, then the redreſſe of greivances, or making of lawes, which were formally talked of to entertaine time, while private annimoſities, and perſonall revenges were made the ſole buſines of importance, & in the ſpace of fower moneths no one greivance was prepared to be preſented to his Majeſt: and Iconoclaſtes heapes vp vntruths without reſpect to the apparence of their detection, for this firſt Parliament was ſo far from being ſuddenly diſſolved after the King was ſupplyed, that the greate Plague not permitting them to ſit longer at weſt minſter, his Majeſt: adiourned them to Oxford, and in anorher Parliament after the ſupply given him, there was a ſecond meeting, which might have had a longer continuance, if it had inſiſted on the redreſſe of greivances, but whence takes he the occaſion to ſay *Ignominiouſly* diſſolved. Where was the *Ignominie*? Had not his Majeſt: a legall right to do it? And if the houſes would not agree in the redreſſe of greivances, and ſupply of the neceſſities of the Kingdome, their continuance would prove ignominious, not their diſſolving.

Sometimes chuſing rather to miſſe of his ſubſidies. or to rayſe them by illegall courſes, then that the people ſhould not ſtill miſſe of their hopes to be releived by Parliaments.

Iconoclaſtes in his Preface talked of laying parallel actions to words, and heere he vſes words of actions, that never were, for among thoſe Parliaments of his late Majeſt: where can he finde a number to make vp his *Sometimes*, vſing a language, as if the King had called as many Parliaments, as he had raigned yeares? And where can he finde, that the King choſe to miſſe his ſubſidies, that the people ſhould not be releived

leived by Parliaments. Two of the Parliaments are already mentioned: In the third, where he had non, he was ſo farr from chuſing to miſſe of his ſubſidies, if he might have had them, that his reiterated Meſſages to the then houſe of Commons to prepare their greivances, that he mighr apply juſt remedies to them, ſufficiently prove, that nothing was wanting of his part to have received the ſubſidies, and releived the people; Its well knowne, that his Majeſt: had at that time a warr with Spaine, and France, and that nothing, but inevitable neceſſitie on his part, could have made him decline the obtainnig of ſubſidies from that Parliament. And after the houſe of Commons had declared, that they would ſupply him *in ſuch a way, and in ſo ample a meaſure, as ſhould make him ſafe at home, and feared abroade*, they agreed vpon the number of ſubſidies, but voted, that the Bill ſ hould not come into the houſe, till their *greivances* were anſweared. His Majeſt: ſent them there vpon ſeverall Meſſages to haſten them to preſent the *greivances*, which nothing wrought on them, but without any reaſon after long expectatiõ, they denyed to have the bil of ſubſidies brought into the houſe. Its wel known, that no Kingdome had leſſe *greivances*, then that of England vnder his late Majeſt: And the people were perſwaded into an opinion of greivances, not by ſence of Suffering, but the diſputes of Pragmaticall Incendiaries, and they would have reſted quiet, had they not been ſeduced by ſuch Craftsmen, and there is no on thing, that this breaker can name for a *greivance*, which his Maſters, that now Lord it, do not encreaſe.

The firſt he broke of at his coming to the Crowne for no other cauſe, then to protect the Duke of Buckingham againſt them, who had accuſed him, beſides other hainous Crymes, of no leſſe, then poyſoning the deceaſed King his Father.

This Author takes himſelfe not concerned in ſpeaking Truth, for the publike Records of the Kingdome, and ſome late declarations of the pretended Parliament would have held his hand from this falſe aſſertion, if he had valued Truth at the rate of peruſing them, for the *Duke of Buckingham* was not at all accuſed by the firſt Parliament of the King, nor in any Parliament for poyſoning the deceaſed King. He might have found, that in the ſecond Parliament of the King, Among other Articles againſt the *Duke of Buckingham*, he was accuſed for a *Tranſcendent Preſumption, and of dangerous conſequence* touching Phiſicke applyed to the deceaſed King, but the malice of ſuch, as hated the Duke of Duckingham did not extend to an accuſation of poyſoning the deceaſed King, yet the venome of Treaſon in this Author makes him madd, and ſay, that a fact *of preſumption, and of dangerous conſequence* was *a poyſoning*. If ſuch were the wiſedome of a houſe of Parliament to call poyſoning of a King, a preſumption of dangerous conſequence neither King nor people neede be troubled to want their Councell. This is the firſt inſtance, though not the firſt fal-

falſhood of Iconoclaſtes, but to the matter of what he ſajes in that ſecond Parliament, wherein the *Duke of Buckingham* was accuſed, his Majeſt: by Meſſage to the lower houſe told them, he was well pleaſed they ſhould proceede againſt the Duke of Buckingham they did accordingly give vp their Articles to the Lords, the *Duke of Buckingham* made his anſweare, which was ſent down to the Commons, who being vnable to reply to it, ſuch, as then ſwayed the houſe contrary to the Councell of a greate number of the moſt experienced amongſt them reſolved to hinder al proceedings, and neceſſitate the King to a Diſſolution of the Parliament. This is no ſecret, the journall bookes of that houſe ſufficiently evince it.

Still the latter breaking was with more affront, and indignitie put vpon the houſe and her worthyeſt members, then the former.

This appeares not by his ſubſequent reaſon, but if this breaker had thought either the *diſſolving of Parliaments*, *or indignitie*, *and affront to members* any offence, why does he take on him the defence of thoſe, that have *Ignominiouſly* excluded the whole houſe of Lords, and ſo many of the Commons, and among them ſome, whome he termes the *worthieſt perſons* in the Parliament he ſpeakes of; but his reaſons, and narrations are of the ſame ſtuffe; And if any man compare the *affronts*, and *indiginties* offered his Majeſt: by ſome perſons in parliament, and his proceedings againſt them, he will judge, that their provacations exceeded his paſſion, and their owne ſufferings.

In ſo much, that in the fifth yeare of his Raigne in a Proclamation he ſeemes offended at the very Rumour of a Parliament divulg'd among the people, as if he had taken it for a kinde of ſlander, that men ſhould thinke him that way exorable much leſſe inclined.

What ſtrawes this man pickes vp. If the King did ſeeme offended at a factious *Rumour*, doth it follow, that he held it a Scandall to act that, which was *Rumoured*. Becauſe a King doth forbid *Rumours* of his intended Actions, doth he not therefore intend them? And muſt his Councells be the ſubject of common *Rumour?* It is a factious practice to ſpreade a Rumour of a parliament, before the King pleaſe to declare it, and tends to the precipitation of his Councells by ſedition. But as his premiſſes are *(he ſeemes)* ſo his concluſions are *(as if)* and men may as well beleive him on his bare word, as ſuch inferences he appearing inexorable to ſpeake Truth, or forbeare ſlander.

And forbidds it, as a preſumption to preſcribe him any time for Parliaments that is to ſay, eyther by perſwaſion or petition, or ſo much, as the reporting of ſuch a Rumour, for other manner of Preſcribing was at that time not ſuſpected.

His Majeſt: therein forbad no more then the law forbidds, and accounts it a preſumption to *Preſcribe* him any time for Parliaments. But ſuch, as have deſtroyed King, and Parliament would

have it esteemed strange, that they should not prescribe what they list, and the breaker, that would have the King *Prescribed* will allow non to *Prescribe* his now masters. His explanation signifies nothing, for doth he thinke, that the King ought to be petitioned, or perswaded by every on, that will, or that the spreading of a Rumour is a fit meanes to induce him to call a Parliament? He endeavours to defame the King for restrayning popular licence, and Sedition, and when he seekes to confirme the Tyranny of his Masters, he reproaches the people with Levitie, and violence; And the wayes of *Prescribing* by him mentioned were vnorderly, and by him particularised as Plausible, not sound, *other manner of Prescribing was then not Suspected*, he intends the force of a scotts Army, and though he commend that way of Prescribing, and attribute the calling of the Parliament to it, and accuse the King for resisting it, yet he will charge the King with beginning the warr.

By which feirce Edict, the people forbidden to complaine, as well, as forced to suffer began from thence foorth to despaire of Parliaments.

The people have now greater cause to *dispaire of Parliaments* then ever they had in the time of his late Majest: for if these men prevaile, they are sure never to have more, for they professe to introduce a new form of Government which hath nothing of the Parliament of England & however the people by seditious practices, or false apprehensions *despaired of Parliaments*, that proves nothing of his Majest: inclination, or aversenes to Parliaments. How an edict can be called feirce, where no punishment of the breach of it appeares to be denounced, nor any severitie ensuing it, cannot be imagined, but its well knowne what Titles this Author wil give to any of his Majest: Actions respecting only the reproachfullnes of the Termes, not their proportion, or congruitie to what they are applyed, and whoever lookes on the time, while Parliaments were intermitted, the sufferings of the people were lesse, then when Parliaments were frequent, & they neede not be forbidden to complaine, when their peace, & plentie were a reason strong enough to restraine them, however querulous murmurings wrought by seditious contrivers, may happē, & ought to be forbiddē in al just Governments.

Where vpon such illegall Actions, and especially to get vast summs of mony were put in Practice by the King, and his new Officers, as Monopolies, compulsive knighthoods, Coate, Conduct, and Shipmony, the seezing not of on Nabaoths Vineyard, but of whole inheritances, vnder the pretence of forrest, or Crowne lands, Corruption, & bribery compounded for with impunities graunted for the future, as gave evident proofe, that the King never meant, nor could it stand with the Reason of his affaires ever to recall Parliaments.

All the pretences of Tyranny, and oppression, wherewith the Rebells have sought to maske their disloyaltie are reduced to this on summe to get money. That Princes must have supplies from their people for support of the Kingdome cannot be doubted, and where the

lawes

lawes have given the King a richt to demaund money of particular persons in certanie caſes, or of the whole people, theis are no illegall exactions, but due debts. The King of England is entitled by law to diverſe dues from his ſubjects, and of ſuch things his learned Councell, and his Judges have the care, that he looſe not his rights, and they are bound by oath to preſerve them, & if in any caſes they faile in their judgment, their King cannot be guiltie of illegall exactions in following their Councell, and of ſuch nature are the particulars he mentions, vnles Coate, and Conduct money, which had been diſburſed by the Counties for the preſent, where ſouldiers were rayſed, and was of inconſiderable value and to be repayed, and only of practice in caſe of warr when neceſſitie requires greater contributions, and ſuch Actions, as theis the beſt Governments could never avoyde, and thoſe formes of Government, which theis Rebells Preferr before Monarchy ordinairly practis, but they muſt ſupply with exclamations, what they want of matter, and having broken all bounds of dutie, Juſtice, and humanitie, they ſeeke to make the common meanes, which neceſſitie compells Governnours to vſe for publique ſupport, the height of oppreſſion, and Tyranny. The vaſt ſumms received by all the wayes were farr ſhort of that greate charge, which the Kingdome required, and of what former Kings had received in the like ſpace, but inconſiderable in regard of the preſent exactions. He reſembles the legal proceedings in caſes of civil right to Nabaoths vineyard; ſo as al ſuites for recovery of deteined rights is the getting of Nabaoths vineyard, but they that by the blood of many Naboaths have gotten their inheritances would have Civill Controverſies, not bloody murther the ſin of Ahab. *Corruption, and bribery compounded for* with impunitie for the future is a denomination, which cannot be fixt to any Actions of Majeſt: That his Majeſt: hath a power to pardon was never denyed, and therefore no act of grace in that kinde can be illegall, but this, which they call corruption, and bribery was no other, then the fees, which ſome officers received, and were queſtioned to be above their due, & had they been convict, their mulct was pecuniary, and due to the King. They vrged long Cuſtome in their defence, and in a caſe of that nature, where only errour, not corruption, or bribery can be admitted, it was neerer to juſtice, then favour to forbeare proſecution; And as the fact was not illegal, ſo had it been, it was only theirs, by whoſe Councell it was done, and theis men, that profeſſe ſuch zeale againſt corruption, and bribery, pretend, that it was neceſſary to take away the ſtarr chamber, where ſuch Crymes were punisht, and from whence comes it, that it could not ſtand with his majeſt: affaires te recall Parliaments, when his Majeſt: deſired to continue nothing, but what was neceſſary for the Kingdome?

Having brought by theis irregular courſes the peoples intereſt, and his owne to ſo direct an oppoſition, that he might foreſee plainely, if nothing, but a

Par-

Parliament could ſave the people, it muſt neceſſarily be his vndoing.

The King had no intereſt, but that, which was common to the people with him, and nothing, that was their intereſt could be oppoſite to his. The people were very farr from any ſuch apprehenſions of being *Deſtroyed*, or that they might not be ſaved without the *Kings vndoing*; And wherein could the King foreſee his vndoing by Parliament, muſt he neceſſarily foreſee, that a Parliament would follow Traytours againſt him? Or muſt he neceſſarily foreſee that a Parliament would vndertake an illegall, and vn juſt power? Muſt he neceſſarily foreſee, that a Parliament would produce a Rebellion, when no Action was deſired to be continued by him, which was not according to law, nor any greivance duely proved vnredreſſed? But becauſe in the Parliament, which he called a faction deſtroyed him, and hath vndone the Kingdome, therefore Iconoclaſtes would have it plainely to be foreſeene. Such, as know the difference of the laſt from former Parliaments, know likewiſe, that it was not from the condition of the Parliament, but the conjuncture of affaires at the time of calling it, that produced thoſe wicked effects filling the mindes of many with ambitious thoughts, and deſire to lay the foundation of their private greatenes in the publique ruines. It is impoſſible, that the *intereſt* of a King can have an oppoſition to that of his *people* which is vainely fancied by him, or that any thing by him alledged ſhould worke ſuch oppoſition. And although there have been diſputes in Courts, and Parliaments touching the profitts, and rights of the Crowne, yet before this Rebell generation, non were ſo ſhameles to pretend them cauſes of the ſubjects violence, and neceſſarily deſtructive to the King, or people, which had the people imagined would have been the iſſue of a Parliament, they would have had a greater averſion to it, then Iconoclaſtes ſuppoſes in his late Mejeſt: And as the preſervation of the people is the Kings, *intereſt*, ſo his preſervation is theirs, which the people now finde to late, and could not foreſee, that ſuch, as made vſe of the pretence of their intereſt, minded it leaſt.

Till eight, or nine yeares after proceeding with a high hand in theſe enormities, & having the ſecond time levied an injurious warr againſt his native countrey Scotland, and finding all thoſe other ſhifts of rayſing money, which bore out his firſt expedition now to faile him, not of his own choice, and inclination, as any childe may ſee, but vrged by ſtrong neceſſities, and the very pangs of State which his owne violent proceedings had brought him to, he calls a Parliament.

Iconoclaſtes is very induſtrious to ſhew, that he can expreſſe the malice of his heart with his pen, and can give falſe denominations to Actions with greater confidence, then true, where it may advantag his Maſters. The gentle hand wherewith his Majeſt governed during the nine yeares he mentions, brands that high hand of ſlander, and detraction, which this breaker ſtretches out againſt him, and it will fill

poſte-

posteritie with amazement at the folly of the present age, that should take such things for enormities, as *fines for knighthood, Coate, conduct, and shipmony*, whereof some of them were scarce felt, or observed, and the rest easily borne; And submit themselves to *contributions, excises, loanes, and taxes*, to which those, which he calls *enormities* hold no proportion. But not contented with the false appellations of his Majest: Civill Actions, he proceedes to defy, and reproach his Actions for preservation, and defence of his Kingdome, and calls it an injurious warr to resist an invading Enemy. That the Scotts were entred neere a hundred mile into the Kingdome, at the time he mentions, he cannot be ignorant, and to call the warr injurious on his Majest: part cannot come from any, that thinkes any thing injurious, that Rebells commit, or any thing just that Governours commaund. When any Actions are rehearsed of his Majest: against the Scotts, the Traytours call them vnjust, and amplifie their slander with the Circumstance of his native Countrey. When the Scotts offer obedience to the King, or he concurr with them, they decry such Actions, in respect they are of his native Countrey, thus shifting, saying, and gainsaying to deceive the people. If there any yet remaine, that will trust such common Cheates. His collection, that *necessitie*, and not choice brought the King to call a Parliament followes not from any of his premisses. His Majest: doth not exclude the *necessitie* of his affaires from moving him to call the Parliament: When he sayes, that *he called the Parliament not more by necessitie*, then his owne choice, doth he exclude *necessitie*, or affirme his owne choice only without consideration of Circumstances. Parliaments ought not to be called, but vpon greate occasions, and their too often Convention is a burthen, not an ease to the people, and such was the judgment of the late Parliament at the beginning. It is not new, that *necessities*, have caused Kings to call Parliaments, which yet was never made an Argument to prove their owne vninclination to call a Parliament. His descant vpon *strong necessities, and pangs of state* layes open the Treason of these conspiratours, that plotted how their Country might pine, and languish, that so vnnaturall Emperickes might exercise their bloody practice, and a mercilesse Tyrany could only be exspected from such, as sought their power by their Countreyes sufferings: And if his Majest: proceedings had been violent, they had not produced that necessitie.

First in Ireland, which only was to give him four subsidies, and so to expire, then in England, where his first demaund was but twelue subsidies to maintaine a Scotch warr condemned, and abominated by the whole Kingdome, promising their greivances should be considered afterwards.

The Parliament in Ireland he might have knowne was not the first, that was, called in the nine yeares he mentions, but falshood are so common, that mistakes are not worth the observation, and if the King

had called that Parliament *in Ireland* to obtaine fower ſubſidies, where had been the fault? May not a King call a Parliament to be ſupplyed? But if Iconoclaſtes had patience to know truth, or ſpeake it, he might eaſily have found a greate number of good lawes made in that Parliament, to worke a conformitie of that nation to England, and he vnſeaſonably produced this inſtance of the Parliament of *Ireland*, which ſo mainely contradicts his aſſertion, for the neceſſities alone he ſuppoſes could not worke the calling of that Parliament, where Parliaments had been ſo frequent before. ¶ *In England, where* he ſayes *his Majeſt: firſt demaund was, but twelue ſubſidies*, he hath loſt his expectation, and his Ironicall *but* hath loſt its mirth for he cannot thinke, that the people now apprehend twelue ſubſidies ſo greate a demaund by the King, when they ſee a farr greater proportion given the Scotch for invading the Kingdome, and after ſuch an execrable warr, and barbarous prodigalitie their greivance is increaſt, and all, that is effected, or pretended to be done for them is the Deſtruction of King, and Church, and dividing the Eſtates of both among the Maſter Rebells, vpon whoſe Arbitrary, and vnlimited power they muſt now depend. That theſe *twelue ſubſidies* were demaunded to maintaine Scotch warr hath no colour of truth, it being not at al propounded; And as it had been a ſottiſh, and perverſe diſpoſition to have condemned the warr againſt the Scotts, when they were in preparation to invade England, ſo it is as ſhameleſly ſaid by Iconoclaſtes, that it was *condemned and abominated by the whole people*. Himſelfe if a wicked obduration had not made him love lying, muſt have confeſſed, that the late Earle of Eſſex, though afterward in Rebellion againſt the King, with greate demonſtrations of Zeale, and affection to his Majeſt: went a Commaunder in that expedition; And if we reſpect the qualitie, or number of noble, & worthy perſons that engaged themſelves in that firſt warr, our ſtories have rarely remembred an Army, that went into Scotland of greater number of eminent perſons, ſo as Iconoclaſtes hath juſt cauſe to condemne, and abominate himſelfe for the Lewdenes, and evidence of this vntruth, and if the then Parliament had not been abuſed by ſome repreſenting his Majeſt: deſires, the deſignes of ſuch, as meant to make advantage of the breach of that Parliament had been diſappointed, and the Calamities enſuing had been prevented; And as there were no greivances then in the Kingdome, but might admit longer delay of redreſſe, then the publique neceſſities of ſupply, ſo his Majeſt: might juſtly demaund ſubſidies in the firſt place with promiſe to redreſſe their greivances afterwards; And Iconoclaſtes too late obſerves the order of that demaund of his late Majeſt: to be amiſſe, when the late Parliament graunted ſo many ſubſidies for the Scotts without expectation of any ſuch promiſe.

Which when the Parliament, who judged that warr it ſelfe on of their maine grei-

greivances, made no haſte to graunt, not enduring the delay of his impatient will, or els fearing the conditions of their graunt, he breakes of the whole ſeſſion and diſmiſſes them, and their greivances with ſcorne and fruſtration.

That the Parliament judged that *warr* any of their *greivances*, that never mentioned it in their debates, or reſolutions is fit for the affirmation of this Author only. But if the Parliament had judged that warr one of their maine greivances, the reſt, whereof ſo greate noyſe hath been made, will hardly be thought weightie. This warr was then newly begun, the King had received no ſupply from the people for the charge paſt, and could this be a maine greivance? Wee ſee at what rate this man makes greivances, and to what ordinary accidents he applies his exorbitant expreſſions. The then Parliament would not have been ſlow in his Majeſt: ſupply, if ſome falſe Miniſters had not interpoſed, and ſome ſeditious perſons had not plotted to impoſe a neceſſitie vpon his Majeſt: to diſſolue the Parliament. They had not preſented him any *greivances* and therefore there could be no ſuch *diſmiſſion with ſcorne and fruſtration*, as he Phraſes it. There were evident tokens of greife, and diſcontent in his late Majeſt: that he was neceſſitated to that act, but there was reioycing, and inſolence amongſt the turbulent Sectaries for it.

Much leſſe therefore did he call this laſt Parliament by his owne choice, and inclination, but having firſt tryed in vaine all vndue wayes to procure mony, his Army of their owne accord being beaten in the north, the Lords petitioning, and the generall voyce of the people all moſt hiſſing him, and his ill acted Regalitie of the Stage, compelled, at length both by his want, and by his feares, vpon meere extreamitie he ſummoned this laſt Parliament.

This man acts the part of a Lord of miſrule to ſtirre the paſſions of the people with taunts, and abuſes, and for his over acted petulant ſcurrilitie fitt to be whipped of the ſtage. If he had ever given proofe of his owne courage, hee would not thus barbarouſly reproach his late Majeſt: with feares, who was ſo well knowne to have hazarded his perſon in ſo many perills, and theſe Phraſes are the froth of a baſe inſultation, not the cenſure of a juſt Ennemy. But why for feare ſhould the King ſummon a Parliament if he fore ſaw, as the libeller ſayes it would be his vndoing? Could he have greater feares, then that? He hath not inſtanced one vndue way of his late Majeſt: to get money for the warr againſt Scotland, & therefore his repetitions import his impertinence, as well, as his malice but gaine no credit by their frequency. *The peoples hiſſing*, which the Traytours deſired, had been as inconſiderable, and vndutifull, as his aſſertions are falſe, but as it no way contradicts, what his Majeſt: ſayes, if the allaying of popular diſcontents, & rectifying miſtakes were one end of calling the Parliament, ſo *the petitioning of the Lords* inſtructs all reaſonable men to thinke, that *feares and wants* were not the *ſole cauſe* of ſummoning that Parliament and that his *Ma-*

jeſt: choice was not excluded. And as the *beating of his Majeſt: Army* had not ſo diſabled him, but that they were in number, and courage ſuperiour to their Enemies, ſo if his Majeſt: *choice* had not guided him, he might with leſſe hazard in common appearance have tryed the ſucceſſe of a battell at that time, then he did at diverſe tymes afterwards. That, which he ſayes of the Armyes, being beaten of their owne accord is little to their honour, if it were true, but infamous to this Author being falſe, & if there were any ſo perfidious to betray their own, and their nations honour vnto ſtrangers, they could not be many, for its a knowne truth, that the moſt eminent perſons in that ſervice, and the greateſt number of common ſouldiers ſerved his Majeſt: afterward in his warrs, not only againſt the English Rebells, but the Scotts.

And how is it poſſible, that he ſhould willingly incline to Parliaments, who never was perceived to call them, but for the greedy hopes of a whole nationall bribe, his ſubſidies, and never loved, never fulfilled, never promoted the true ends of Parliaments, the redreſſe of greivances, but ſtill putt them of, and prolonged them, whether, gratifyed, or not gratifyed, and was indeede the Author of all thoſe greivances.

It hath been already ſhewed, how his Majeſt: was perceived to call Parliaments out of his owne choice, and inclination, and it was not only in his Majeſt: time, but in the time of Queene Eliſabeth, that Parliaments were ſaid to be only called to give ſubſidies, there never wanting malecontents, and ſlanderers of the Actions of Princes, and the caſe may be ſuch, that ſubſidies may be the cheife motive, to call Parliaments, conſidering the ſufficiency of the lawes in force, and the ſmall number of greivances complained of. Malitious detraction is accompanied with abſurditie, and Iconoclaſtes becoming a Champion of Rebellion reckons Tributes, and ſupplies of the ſoveraigne by ſubjects, which is their duty among the number of ſcandalous ſins, and that which was practiſed by our ſaviour, and commaunded by his Apoſtles he calls nationall bribes. This braine ſicke, and prophane Libelling can be acceptable to none, but ſuch, as are delighted with the vnhappy diſtempers of Bedlam. He hath not ſo much paſſion to have greivances redreſt, as love to the word, becauſe, as he thinkes, it imports matter diſpleaſing to the people, who yet are now ſatisfied, that thoſe, which abuſed them by the frequent vſe of the word greivances, never intended the remedy, but by multiplying complaints ſought to leade them into diſcontents againſt the Government, whereby they might become Captive to ambitious vſurpers. That, which he ſayeth is the true end of Parliaments *to reforme greivances* juſtly condemnes thoſe, he now calls a Parliament, who, he well knowes ſitt to no other end, but to encreaſe greivances, and in eight yeares time never redreſſed one. Though Kings take notice of greivances in Parliament, and take order to redreſſe them, yet that cannot be called the true end of calling Parliaments

liaments for there are often occaſions of calling Parliaments in reſpect of publique ſafetie againſt Enemies, and conſpiratours, addition, & alteration of lawes, publique ſupplyes, the *redreſſe of greivances* is accidentall to the Parliament, and the pretence of greivances hath proved the greateſt greivance, that ever the people ſuffered, and his ſcurrilous objection of *greedy hope* to his late Majeſt: on whome malice it ſelfe hath not yet layd ſuch a Cryme encreaſeth the Libellers infamy, not the weight of his charge.

To ſay therefore, that he called this Parliament of his owne choice, and inclination argues how little truth, wee can expect from the ſequell of this booke, which ventures in the very firſt period to affront more, then one nation, with an vntruth ſo remarkeable.

If the *venturing* vpon an *vntruth* in the *firſt period* be an argument to expect little in the ſequell of the booke, what may we expect of this Author, whoſe whole booke is a confutation of his *firſt period*, not to deſcant on the Kings miſfortunes? That in ſeeking to diſprove this firſt period adventured on ſo many palpable vntruths, and ſtickes not to pervert the very period it ſelfe, and affront not only more, then one nation, but all indifferent men? For if his Majeſt: had been neceſſitated either through the diſorder of perſons to diſſolve Parliaments, or for beare them, he might yet call a Parliament by his owne choice, conſidering, that not the condition of Parliament, but the malevolence of ſome perſons were cauſe both of the diſſolution, & forbearance. The often Parliaments in Ireland, & the precedent Parliaments in England to that, which he mentions, maintaine the truth of that *firſt period* againſt the many remarkeable falſities of this Image breaker.

And preſumes a more implicit faith in the people of England, then the Pope ever commaunded from the Romiſh laitie, or els a naturall ſottiſhnes fitt to be abuſed, and ridden.

Kings may expect credit to their words from their people, Rebells cannot though experience hath confirmed that if a greate part of the people of England had not followed them with a more *blinde*, and obſtinate *beleife*, then ever *Romiſh laitie* did their Pope, they could never have been ridden, and jaded, as now they are. And Iconoclaſtes could never preſume the beleife of his extravagant aſſertions, if he thought not his readers of worſe, then *naturall ſottiſhnes to be abuſed*, for while they lye groveling vnder the Tyrany of their preſent oppreſſours, and lament the loſſe of their happines vnder the Kingly Government, this man will perſwade them out of their ſenſe, and memory.

While in the judgment of wiſemen by laying the foundation of his defence on the avouchment of that, which is ſo manifeſtly vntrue, he hath given a worſe foyle to his own cauſe, then when his whole forces were at any time overthrowne.

Surely there wiſemē ſhewed as little reaſon, in judging an aſſertion, as knowledge in military affaires, that made by compariſon of this period to the defeat of an army. If his Maj: have *given ſo greate a foyle to his cauſe*

by the firſt period of his booke whence comes the danger, that Iconoclaſtes would prevent? Was this firſt period vnintelligible without his comment, and what is it to the Kings, cauſe, whether he called the Parliament of his owne choice, or not. Its very likely his *wiſe men* heere are the ſame with his *wel principled men* he mentioned els where, & their principles, or impiety being the ſame with his, their judgment is as corrupt, as their conſcience, and as farr from wiſedome, as the libeller from modeſtie, and if any had ſuch a judgment, they might ſoone finde their errour, which all others deſcerne, and ſuch a judgment were a greater foyle to their wiſedome, then to his Majeſt: cauſe.

They therefore, who thinke ſuch greate ſervice done to the Kings affaires in publiſhing this booke will finde themſelves in the end miſtaken, of ſenſe, & right minde, or but any mediocritie of knowledge, and remembrance hath not quite forſaken men.

They will finde themſelves no whit miſtaken if *ſenſe, right minde*, and *mediocritie of knowledge*, and remenbrance have not quite forſaken men, but the libeller, will finde himſelfe very much miſtaken, if he expect, that his ſenſe ſhalbe ſo received againſt apparent truth, as to give a greater foyle, then the defeate of Arimes, and vnderſtanding muſt have left the world, where the Author of ſuch a compariſon findes credit.

He comes now to proſecute his Majeſt: diſcourſe in purſuance of that period, and firſt to what his Majeſt: affirmes of Parliaments *to have allwayes thought the right way of them moſt ſafe to his Crowne, and beſt pleaſing to his people*, he ſayes we felt from his Actions what he thought of Parliaments, or of pleaſing his people.

The people feele now, that, which makes them confeſſe, that they had juſt cauſe by what they felt from his Majeſt: Actions to be well pleaſed with them, & to beleive, what he affirmes heere to be his judgment of Parliaments, and if any people were pleaſed with the ill way of Parliaments, they have ſeene their errour by the evill conſequents, and now thinke the *right way of them only moſt ſafe for the Crowne, & them*, and that nothing, but ruine to the Kingdome can be expected from diſorderly Parliaments.

He goes on to that, which his Majeſt: adds, that the cauſe of forbearing to Conveene Parliaments was the ſparkes, which ſome mens diſtempers there ſtudied to kindle. To this the libeller ſayes, *they were not temperd to his temper, for it neither was the law, nor Rule, by which all other tempers were to be tryed, but they were choſen for fitteſt men in their Counties to quench thoſe diſtempers, which his inordinate doings had inflamed.*

Is the choice in Counties the law, and rule whereby tempers are to be tryed? And would the libeller have it beleived, that all ſuch, as are choſen in the Counties, are of better *temper*, then the King. If choice be the *law of temper*, why doth he juſtifie thoſe men, which have affronted, ſcorn'd, and puniſhed ſuch, as have been choſen by the Counties?

If

If all are ſo well *temperd*, why are ſome ſo ill handled, and excluded? And if there may be diſtempers, as he muſt confeſſe in deſpight of impudence, why was it not a juſt reaſon of his Majeſt: forebearance, if he found it? We know what fires ſmall ſparkes kindle in greate Aſſemblies, and we have felt the flame of them like the ſudden eruption of burning Mountaines, when all was quiet, and there were men, that ſtudyed to turne the Parliament into confuſion having not the temper to quench, but to enflame.

Were theſe men, that were of the two Parliaments in the firſt yeare of his Majeſt: Raigne; The firſt called within two moneths after he begun, the ſecond within twelue, *choſen to allay thoſe diſtempers, which his inordinate doings had inflamed*, what were theſe *inordinate doings, that could inflame* ſo ſuddenly? We neede not argue this Authors credit from one vntruth, but he would obtaine ſome credit, if one entire truth could be found in him.

If that were his refuſing to conveene till thoſe men had been quallified to his will, wee may eaſily conjecture what hope there was of Parliaments, had not feare, and his inſatiate povertie in the middeſt of his exceſſive wealth conſtrained him.

His Majeſt: might with reaſon exſpect, that many, who through errour had cauſed diſtempers, might returne to a right minde ſeeing his temper, and their little reaſon to deſire ſuch Parliaments, as make it their whole worke to divide the peoples affections from the King, and follow the Councells of ſuch, as are malecontents for want of preferment, and if men had been quallified to his Majeſt: will, Parliaments would have had happier, ſucceſſe, and the people pleaſed with their agreement, that now groane vnder the miſeries of their diviſion. But whence his inſatiate povertie in the middeſt of his exceſſive wealth ſhould conſtraine him is not vnderſtood, wants, and wealth are inconſiſtent. This libeller hath greate povertie of ſenſe in the middeſt of his exceſſive expreſſions. He goes an ill way to prove that the King was ſo vninclined to Parliaments, and that povertie compelled him, if he had wealth certainly that would have kept him from hazarding a courſe ſo diſliked. He ſhalbe rich, and poore, that ſome may contemne his povertie, others may grudge his wealth.

The King hoped by his Freedome, and their moderation to prevent miſvnderſtandings. To this ſayes Iconoclaſtes, *wherefore not by their Freedome, and his moderation.*

The Champion cannot ſuffer a King to paſſe without ſignifying to him, that there is no difference betweene King, and ſubject. The King had reſolved to vſe *Freedome* in his conceſſions, and hoped they would vſe *moderation* in their demaunds. This man would have him ſay, that they ſhould vſe *Freedome* in their demaunds & he would vſe *moderation* in his conceſſions, hath he not made it a proper ſpeech? Will his *wiſe*,

and

and well principled men thinke him a fit Champion to breake Bell,& the Dragon? But he gives a reaſon, why the King would ſpeake ſenſe, for *he thought* ſayes he *Freedome to high a word for them, and moderation too meane for himſelfe*, and he concludes, *this was not the way to prevent miſvnderſtanding*. Its ſure this man tooke the way to make miſvnderſtandings, that would have *Freedome* applyed to the people, what ever the ſubject be, that is ſpoken of,and its like he would be well pleaſed,that they had *Freedome* from law,proſperitie,loyaltie, and obedience,which might be as well ſpoken, as the ſenſe he hath framed to prevent miſvnderſtandings.

He ſayes *the King ſtill feared paſſion, and prejudice in other men, not in himſelfe, and doubted not by the weight of his owne reaſon to counterpoiſe any faction,it being ſo eaſie for him, and ſo frequent to call his obſtinacie reaſon,and other mens reaſon faction.*

He had greate reaſon to feare paſſion, and prejudice in others,which he had ſo often tryed, and which they, that then feared not have ſince found true, and the conceſſions the King purpoſed, and performed might make him confident to counterpoyſe any faction, but the libeller will have it beleived,that he, which graunted more, then any of his Predeceſſours was obſtinate, and they, that demaunded what former Parliaments thought vnreaſonable, and impious, had reaſon. But the King was deceived,that had to doe with Monſters,not reaſonable men.

We in the meane while muſt beleive, that wiſedome, and all reaſon came to him by Title with his Crowne: Paſſion, prejudice, and faction to others by being ſubjects.

Kings have advantages above others for wiſedome, and reaſon,they are aſſiſted with diverſe Councells,and in publique affaires reaſon muſt be preſumed in Kings, and faction feared in ſubjects, nature being averſe to ſubmit, and intereſts, and partialities incident to all greate Aſſemblyes, and the detraction from the wiſedome of Rulers in the Rebells foundation, and a ſure ſigne of corrupt intentions.

He was ſorry to heare with what popular heate elections were carryed in many places. To theſe words of the Kings he ſayes *ſorry rather, that Court, letter, and intimations prevailed no more to divert,or to deterre the people from their free election of thoſe men, whome they thought beſt affected to Religion, & their Countryes libertie, both at that time in danger to be loſt.*

They were in danger to be loſt by a Trayterous conſpiracie with an invading enemy, but no other danger imaginable to any. There was never leſſe cauſe to complaine of Court letters, and intimations, nor ever greater miſtakes of perſons choſen, the Countryes affections to Religion, and libertie making way for the inſinuations of Hypocriticall ſeducers, and had the Countryes knowne the diſpoſitions of the men they choſe, as their Actions have ſince diſcovered, they would not have truſted them with their Religion, and libertie, which they

have

have betrayed. This Image breaker declaimes againſt the violence,& levitie of the people, and heere calumniates his Majeſt: for obſerving the popular heate, whereby elections were carryed in ſome places, it being a moſt knowne truth,that popular,heate is as frequent vpon ſuch occaſions,as any other, witnes the long annimoſities between families, and the greate contentions, that ariſe from ſuch Elections.

Among the many clamours in the late Parliament, where malice was as buſie,as this Author is now to finde out Court letters to divert, or deterre the people from free Elections, there was not one inſtance produced of ſuch *letters or intimations*. How wickedly induſtrious many were to blow abroade jealoſie, & ſuſpition of the danger of Religion, & libertie, & how cauſeleſſely the people in many places were drawne into paſſion by vaine ſurmiſes,is too well knowne, and it is too late,for the Image breaker to ſeeke to reduce the people into thoſe miſopinions, which they have detected by too deare bought experience, for they well ſee, that there was no way ſo certaine to endanger Religion, and libertie, as that they were ſeduced into, vpon pretence to preſerve them.

And ſuch men they were, as by the Kingdome were ſent to adviſe him, not ſent to be Cavilled at, becauſe elected, or to be entertained by him with an vndervalue, and miſpriſion of their temper, judgment, or affection.

Though ſuch, as were elected, were not ſent by the Kingdome,but by the reſpective places, one not intermedling with another,yet if Iconoclaſtes had not been more forward to expreſſe his impotencie, then warry in producing reaſon,he would not have ſpokē of being Cavilled at, whereof he had not montioned the leaſt colour, and if he hold the perſons of men elected ſo ſacred, & the King faultie for not eſteeming them, as he ought, what is the reaſon, that he defends the Tumults, that reproacht, and aſſaulted them; What is the reaſon he profeſſes ſo much honour to thoſe Maſters, that plucked them out of the houſe, & kicked them into priſons? Kings ſend for their ſubjects to adviſe with them, and Iconoclaſtes might finde by the Elections of members of the lower houſe, that they were ſent to doe, & conſent to ſuch things, as ſhould be ordained with the common Councell of the Kingdome, and therefore miſtakes their directions,that ſayes they were ſent to adviſe him,& with what childish levitie doth he inſult on his ſoveraigne, for vndervaluing of the *temper*, judgment, or affection of perſons choſen,as if their Elections refined their natures, & ſublimated their tempers, as this mans Rebellion hath inflamed, and beſotted him.

In vaine was a Parliament thought fitteſt, by the knowne lawes of our nation to adviſe, and regulate vnruly Kings, if they inſteede of hearkning to advice, ſhould be permitted to turne it of, and refuſe it by vilifying, and traducing their adviſers, or by accuſing of a popular heate, thoſe that lawfully elected them.

If a Parliament were thought fitteſt by the knowne lawes of our Kingdome,

to regulate vnruly Kings, it was certainly *in vaine*, for ſuch Kings, as ſtories report moſt irregular, were leaſt *regulated* by Parliaments, but on the contrary the Parliaments concurd to their deſires, and in ſuch extravagant Actions, as were the greateſt blemiſhes of their Government, & Iconoclaſtes doth well to make a ſuppoſition of *knowne lawes*, for he knowes not any, that thought his ſuppoſition true, for the knowne lawes will not ſuppoſe an *vnruly King*, and therefore cannot thinke of a way to *regulate* what they will not ſuppoſe, but were it ſuppoſed, that a Parliament were the *fitteſt way to regulate* vnruly Kings, doth it follow, that there wilbe no *heate in elections*, nor noe miſadvice in perſons elected? Muſt the King take all for truth, and reaſon, that any of theſe adviſers will tell him; Or is a Major part of them ſo infallible, as the whole Kingdome muſt ſtand, or perish by the advantage of a few voyces, & perhaps one onely? But this breaker hath broken out into this vnnaturall heate, vpon the alone mention of *heate in Elections*, a matter not only of poſſibilitie, but knowne truth.

His owne, & his Childrens intereſt obliged him to ſeeke, & preſerve the love, and welfare of his ſubjects. To this of his Majeſt: he ſayes. *Who doubts it, but the ſame intereſt common to all Kings, was never yet availeable to make them all ſeeke that, which was indeede beſt for themſelves, & their poſteritie.*

But if it be *the intereſt* of Kings to preſerve the love, and welfare of their ſubjects, in vaine doth Iconoclaſtes from the tranſgreſſions of particular perſons defame the ſacred office of Kings, and endeavour to ſet vp vſurpers, whoſe *intereſt* cannot ſo much oblidge them to the love, & welfare of the people. He ſayes all men are oblidged by their *intereſt* to *honeſtie*, and *Iuſtice*, *but that conſideration workes litle in private men.* It ſeemes by his writing, it workes litle in him, that ſo litle regards *honeſtie*, and *Iuſtice*. But his *intereſt* is not to regard it, for the *intereſt* of his profitt; and eſteeme with his Maſters cannot be maintained by *honeſtie*, and *Iuſtice*, and that *intereſt* is more prevalent with him, then the *intereſt* of a good conſcience, or heaven it ſelfe. He might well have deſcerned, that his Majeſt: argued from the Humane, or Civill *intereſt*, which men are apt to judge ſtrongeſt, and the breaker impertinently diverts the ſenſe to talke of mens fayling in the exerciſe of vertue, when their temporall *intereſts* are the cauſe of their miſcarriage, and therefore his Majeſt: reaſon was ſtrong, that ſince his intereſt, as well, as right carried him to the inclination he mentioned, it might be more probable to others. But the Image breaker admits no reaſons, nor gives any, but magiſterially layes downe his poſition, *that Kings have leſſe conſideration of honeſtie, & Iuſtice then other men.* It were an injury to that high calling to offer an anſweare to ſuch a barking detractour againſt the moſt approved, moſt ancient, and moſt ſacred office for the preſervation of Humane ſocietie, that will deprave that, which God hath ſanctified, and will make thoſe, by whome God diſpenſeth the bleſ-

ſings

ſings of peace vnto men, the greateſt Enemies to God, and goodnes.

He intended to oblidge both friends, & Enemies, and to exceede their deſires, did they but pretend to any modeſt, and ſober ſenſe. To this he ſayes *miſtaking the whole buſines of a Parliament, which meete not to receive from him obligations, but Juſtice, nor he to expect from them their modeſtie, but their grave advice vttered with Freedome in the publique cauſe.*

This man miſtakes the whole buſines of a Parliament, that would exclude modeſtie from the advice, and libertie from the adviſed. The freedome, that the libeller intends is inconſiſtent with modeſtie, aswell, as Monarchy, Trayterous diſpoſitions having an Antipathy to morall vertues. How often have Parliaments made petitions to their King for graces, & were they not oblidged, when they were graunted? But it cannot be expected, that ſuch, as deſpiſe dutie ſhould willingly acknowledge the right of thoſe, to whome it belongs, and ſuch, as vſe no modeſtie will acknowledge no gratitude, or obligation. If their advice had been grave, their behaviour would have been modeſt, and they whoſe dutie was only to adviſe, had no pretence to Commaund, and dictate, nor they, that were to receive Juſtice from their King, to ſnatch what they deſired, and become judges of their owne demaunds. Such as wil not be oblidged by lawes, nor oaths cannot by benefites, & favours, and ſuch, as have robbed a King of his power, grow quickely to that heigth of impudence to deny he had ever any, as this Author, that is ſo Brutish to affirme, that Kings cannot oblidge their ſubjects, & thence it followes, that they owe no thankes to God for a good King, as they profeſſe to owe him none for his good Government.

His talke of modeſtie in their deſires of the common welfare argues him not much to have vnderſtood, what he had to graunt, who miſconceived ſo much the nature of what they had to deſire.

His excepting at the talke of modeſtie ſhewes how little he vnderſtands other modeſtie, or the right, or practice of Parliament. Is not humilitie a word of larger ſignification, then modeſtie, and yet this breaker will make modeſtie contrary to the nature of the Parliaments deſires, and the Kings graunts, when humilitie is the common expreſſion of the Parliaments petitions to the King. And he might well have ſaid the King vnderſtood not, what he had to graunt, if he had not expected his ſubjects deſires to have a modeſt, and ſober ſenſe. Can there be deſires of the common-welfare, that exclude modeſt, & ſober ſenſe? But the truth is the deſires of the late faction in the name of Parliament had neither modeſt, nor ſober ſenſe, and thence the libeller would inferr it vnneceſſary, and it was very farr from the nature of what they had to deſire to demaund their Kings Crowne.

And for ſober ſenſe the expreſſion was too meane, and recoiles with as much diſhonour vpon himſelfe to be a King, where ſober ſenſe could poſſible be ſo wanting in a Parliament.

And muſt it be the Kings diſhonour, if an Aſſembly of Parliament want ſober ſenſe, how does that recoile vpon him, can he make them otherwiſe? Iconoclaſtes lately reprehended his mention of heate in Elections, and now its the Kings diſhonour, if the Parliament want ſober ſenſe. was there never experience of a Parliament, that wanted ſober ſenſe, or was any man ſo ſavage, as to hold ſober ſenſe too meane for a greate Councell? Wee have ſeene not only ſober ſenſe, but al Religion, reaſon, law, & Juſtice, wanting in a Parliament, being taken for the prevalent partie, and Hiſtories record it to have happened, more, then once. Kings have been vnhappy in ſuch Parliaments, but the diſhonour, and infamy reſts vpon ſuch Aſſemblyes, and theſe Apologiſts are the Trumpetts of their ſhame, not the covers of their nakednes.

The odium, and offences, which ſome mens rigour, or remiſſenes in Church, & ſtate had contracted vpon his Government, he reſolved to have expiated with better lawes, and regulations. To this he ſayes *the worſt miſdemeanours of rigour or remiſſenes he hath taken vpon himſelfe, as often as the Clergy, or any other of his Miniſters felt themſelves over-burthened with the peoples hatred. He inſtances in the ſuperſtitious rigour of his ſundayes Chappell, remiſſenes of his ſundayes Theatre, that reverend ſtatute for Dominicall Iiggs, & Maypoles derived from the Example of his Father Iames, which teſtifies, that all ſuperſtition, and remiſſenes in Religion iſſued from his authoritie, and the generall miſcarriages in ſtate imputed cheifely to himſelfe.*

That the *remiſſenes and rigour* of ſome men may contract *odium*, and *offence* in the beſt *Governments* was never doubted, but that this libeller would take occaſion from his Majeſt: intention to expiate them with better lawes, to caſt them on his Majeſt: ſhewes that this Rebellion aroſe not from offences in Government, but wicked inclinations of ambition, & Covetuouſnes, and that amendments were not deſired but confuſion. It was juſt, & honourable, that the King ſhould take on him the defence of his lawes againſt Sectaries, and the protection of officers, in the exerciſe of juſt authoritie, againſt the hatred of frenitique perſons. The hipocriſie of the ſchiſmaticall partie, that profeſſed greate tendernes of conſcience, and greife to ſee Children whipp a top on a ſunday, was ridiculous to al ſober men, yet theis are the motives to embroyle a ſtate. That, which he calls the *ſuperſtitious rigour of his ſundayes Chappell* is noe other, then obſervation of the order of the Church of England, which none, but the Bedlam Browniſts ever called ſuperſtitious. His Majeſt: Chappell had nothing in the exerciſe of Devotion, but what the lawes of his Predeceſſours had appointed, and this muſt be his rigour. That, which he calls his ſundayes Theatre it ſeemes are recreations vpon ſundayes, and to that he prophanely, and ſcurrilouſly adds his Dominicall Jiggs. Can a Chriſtian, that hath reſpect to the day, make Dominicall the matter of his jeſt, but having abuſed ſacred titles to impious Actions, they proceede to ſcoffe with them. He intimates

mates a booke publiſhed touching recreations, wherein his Majeſt: followed the example of his Royall father, and the advice of the moſt learned Divines. Judaiſme, and ridiculous ſuperſtition of the hipocriticall ſectaries cheifely occaſioned that booke both in the time of his Majeſt: and King James. Permiſſion of ſunday recreations is more agreeable to the doctrine, & practice of other Churches, then the prohibition, & the pretended tendernes of conſcience in the Sectaries, appeares as falſe, as frivolous, and theſe Sectaries, that make this imaginary rigour, and remiſſenes a foundation to overthrow a Kingdome allow noe limits to their owne rigour, and remiſſenes, taking all libertie to themſelves, & denying any to others. Why are theis doughty objections made againſt his Majeſt: when all know it touches not him particularly (if it were conſiderable) but his Father, & queene Elizabeth, in whoſe times recreations on ſundayes were more practiſed, then in the time of his Majeſt: & by the way we may take notice of his ſcornefull appellation of his Father James. And for the miſcarriages in ſtate, wee may expect, that as the Actions will be by this Author vnfaithfully related, ſoe they will appeare of as litle weight for a ground to thoſe Calumnies, which he frames vpon them.

His Majeſt: diſavowed none of theſe acts, till this Parliament, and heere ſeekes to wipe of the envy of his evill Government vpon his ſubſtitutes.

His Majeſt: allwayes diſavowed illegall Acts, and whatever other mens rigour, or remiſſenes had contracted. And muſt a King ſatisfie the curioſitie, & malice of all, that caſt envy on his Government? And was there ever a Parliament, wherein lawes were not made to expiate the odium contracted. When his Majeſt: ſeekes to take away the occaſions of evill in his ſubſtitutes, he deſerves the love, and thankes of his people, but it is the practice of Rebells to caſt the rigour, and remiſſenes of the ſubſtitutes vpon the Government. His Majeſt: ought not to beare the evill of other mens Actions, and his Government wilbe glorious to poſteritie, as it was happy to them, that enjoyed it in deſpight of envy, and this Author, and ſuch, as ſeeke to wipe of the guilt of this lewde Rebellion, by pretences of evill Government, which can noe more juſtifie their fact, then provocation a private Duell, ſufficiently cleere his Majeſt: of their reproaches by the lightnes of theſe objections, and by offering vulgar envy, as a reaſon to deſtroy the Kingdome. He goes on jeering the Kings *promiſes*, for reforminge Religion, as *too late*, and becauſe popular confuſions had overtopt reaſon, therefore he concludes their Juſtice in working miſcheife, and breaking all the bonds of faith, and Religion. The purpoſes, which his Majeſt: had for reforminge Religion, could not by him be *expreſſed artificiallie* to gaine abatement of that violence, vnder which he ſuffered, for they are noe other, then what he had often propoſed in the beginninge of the Parliament, and the workes

of the dead King loſe not their weight, becauſe they declare to the world the vnjuſt vſurpation of his authoritie.

All his vndertakings heeretofore declared him to have little, or no judgment in that worke of Religion. This libellers booke declares him to have little conſcience of Religion, & no wonder, if ſchiſmatickes are ſo ſhamles in the contempt of the greateſt judgments, that differ from them, when they acknowledge the authoritie of no perſon over them, and that, which Iconoclaſtes pronounces heere of the King, he will not ſticke to determine of all the world beſides, that agree not with his ſect. Sectaries are no leſſe inſolent, and cruell, then falſe, and fantaſtique, there being not any like exceſſe in ſuch, as attaine to higheſt preferments in Church, or ſtate by ordinary wayes, as in thoſe popular ſeducers, preſumption being of more force, then truth with vulgar ſpirits, and thence this Champion of ſchiſmatickes not only vilifies his Majeſt: judgment in Religion, but tells the world, *That his breeding, or courſe of life could not acquaint him with a thing ſo ſpirituall.* The breeding, and courſe of life of this generation of ſectaries is not vnknowne, and they ſeeke to ſupply with impudence, what they want of abilitie. It were a fault to mention heere his Majeſt: parts, learning, and pietie, and the Scripture, which directs vs to try the ſpirits hath given vs ſuch markes of the falſe, and lying ſpirits, as wee ſhould be much wanting to ourſelves, if wee could not judge thoſe men, that are proud-boaſters, deſpiſers of Parents, deſpiſers of Dominion, Traytours, faith-breakers to be ſuch, as deſcerne not the things of the ſpirit, though they pretend to them.

The Reformation, they could expect from him muſt be ſome politique forme of an impoſed Religion, or perpetuall vexation to ſuch, as comply not with that forme.

And let all the Churches, that profeſſe the name of Chriſt through the world be produced, and there is none of them, but have a forme of Religion which this libeller heere calls *politicke*, and an *impoſed Religion*, and the obſervation of ſuch formes are in all Chruches exacted with ſome penalties, and heereby all men may ſee, that wee have not to doe with a confined Rebell, that hath only diſaffection to the Government of the place, where he lives, but one, that accuſes all Churches, but his owne Conventicle to have litle, ore no judgment in Religion, and not acquainted with a thing ſo ſpirituall, for the ground of this reproach is from his Majeſt: reſolution to vſe formes in the publique duties of Religion in the Church.

The like amendment, he ſayes, *he promiſes in ſtate, not a ſtep further, then his reaſon, and conſcience told him was fitt to be deſired, wiſhing he had kept with in thoſe bounds, and not ſuffered his owne judgment to have been overborne in ſome things, And this* he ſayes *is to ſet vp an Arbitrary Government, & all Brittany to be chained to the conſcience, judgment, and reaſon of one man, as*

if

if those guifts were entayled vpon him, with his Fortune to be a King.

Wee know not the Misteries of this mans Religion, otherwise we might demaund of him, why the King should goe further, then his reason, and conscience directed him, and why the libeller, & his Mates should hould it lawfull for them to spurne at al lawes both in Church, and state vpon pretence of their reason, and conscience against them, he cannot deny to have done this, & they should doe well to shew, how the King may goe against his reason, & conscience. Is it intayled vpon him with his Fortune, as a King to have lesse priviledge, then they? & must he renounce his owne reason, and conscience to the advice of a Parliament? And must they controll him, and the Parliament? Surely the King must give an account to God for the Talents, he hath lent him. But how can the breaker conclude, from the Kings forbearance of Acts, wherein he is vnsatisfied in his conscience, that is to set vp an Arbitrary Government when as nothing is introduced? And why must not all Brittaine be chained to the judgment, reason, and conscience of the King, as well, as all Israell, Gods owne peculiar people, and not only all Brittaine, but the whole world are Chained to the reason, judgment, and conscience of their Rulers be they one, or many, And the seducers would perswade vs, that Brittaine could not be happy, vnles it were reduced to its ancyent barbaritie, and governed by a multitude of Kings, & Religions. God had promised peculiar assistance to Kings, and Commaunds the peoples obedience to them, & the miseries of the Kingdome many be imputed in a greate part to what his Majest: observed, that he had suffered his owne judgment to be overborne in some things.

A Tyrant may make this pretence, and it were in vaine for any Parliament to have reason, judgment, or conscience, if it thwarted the Kings will.

It were much more tollerable for a Tyrant, to pretend conscience in governing, then for a people to pretend conscience in rebelling, and this libeller hath reprehended the peoples levitie, and violence so sharpely, as he cannot if he pretend reason, subject the reason, judgment, and conscience of the Rulers to the controll of the subjects. Because Tyrants may pretend conscience, therefore by good logicque no King may vse it, and becaufe some Kings may not rightly governe, therefore he will have the right judgment in the people, which he so much despises, and which, as it hath been the meanes of the Rebells present power, so it hath been in all ages the cause of confusion, and miserie to states, and Kingdomes. The reason, judgment, and conscience of a Parliament is not therefore in vaine, because not infallible, it is most probable, that a King will follow the best Councell, but it cannot be presumed that in Parliaments, the greater part will continue subjects, if they may be Kings by saying they wilbe, and it was the wisedome of our Ancestours, that would have no lawes made without the will of

their

their King, and they never truſted ſuch, as they choſe further, then to preſent their deſires, and offer their Councell vnto him, and conſent to what ſhould be ordeyned by him with advice of the Lords, & it were in vaine to have a King, if he were not impowred to judge of Councells, or if lawes might be obtruded vpon him, and the people without him. The preſent Calamities teſtifie how vnhappily, and abſurdly a Parliament ſeekes to Commaund, whoſe office is to Councell, and pretend Councell vſeles, vnles they may deprive him, whome they adviſe of the benifit of Councell, taking away his power to vſe it. To what end doe they Councell, if there be none to be Councelled, but all to be commaunded?

That thus theſe promiſes made vpon experience of hard ſufferings, and his moſt mortified retirements being thorowly ſifted, containe nothing much different from his former practices.

His Majeſt: expreſſions being thorowly ſifted containe nothing in them, but pious, and Princely conſiderations, and from this libellers owne mouth all men may ſee, that his Majeſt: practices, againſt which they maliciouſly exclaime were conſonant to Religion, and Juſtice, and only oppoſite to Trayterous, and ſchiſmaticall licence. It was the libellers profeſſion to parrallell his Majeſt: faire ſpoken words, as he calls them to his owne farr different Actions, and now his words, and deedes being ſifted by malice it ſelfe are not much different, the libeller is ſome what ingenuous to diſcover his owne vanitie, and falſ hood.

He leaves it to prudent foreſight, what fruites in likelyhood his Majeſt: reſtorement would have produced.

We have ſeene already the fruites of the inhumane cruelties exerciſed vpon him, and the continuance, and encreaſe of thoſe abominable impieties, that attend ſuch Actions, where of the libeller makes a large profeſſion, who confidently obtrudes laviſh lyes, for knowne truths, petulant inſolence, for ſober ſenſe, & maximes of villany, for ſound Arguments, which are the bitter fruites of diſobedience, and Rebellion.

To that part of the ſection, which he calls *the devout of it, and modelled into the forme of a private Pſalter, he objects nothing*, but his ſpleene, *that it is not to be admired, more then the Arch-Biſhopps late Breviary, and other manualls, and handmaides of Devotion, and theſe he calls the lip worke of every Prelaticall leiturgiſt, quilted out of Scripture Phraſe, with as much eaſe, and as litle neede of Chriſtian diligence, or judgment, as belongs to the compiling of any ordinary, & ſaleable peece of Engliſh Divinitie, that the ſhopps value.*

The Authors of *leiturgies*, and helpes to devotion, have their memory bleſſed by the benifit, which many devout ſoules have acknowledged to have received from their labours, and the crueltie, which bloody Rebells exerciſed on the perſon of the late Arch-biſhopp, and their other barbariſmes, towards the Prelates, to pleaſe that kennell by whome they acted their Rebellion, hath ſatiſfied the world of the nature

ture of Sectaries, of whoſe bloody diſpoſition, many by ſheepes-clothing were much deceived. *Quilting of Scripture Phraſe* was wont, to be the prayſe of their long winded Lecturers, who vſed it more for ſound then ſenſe, but it ſeemes their ſpirit is changed. The libeller will hardly gett credit, vnles with thoſe, for whoſe ſake he doth not profeſſe to write, that is his wiſe, and well principled men the Sectaries, if he affirme, that there is more neede of Chriſtian diligence in the bold, and extempore bablinge of their ſenſeles zealots, then the *compiling of thoſe Leiturgies, and Manualls*, he mentions. And ſuch, as have obſerved the preſumption of this rabble in their prayers, will beleive they hate diligence, as much, as they want judgment. Why Engliſh, or ſaleable ſhould dininiſh the eſteeme of Divinitie is not vnderſtood, but becauſe they are common termes, he would have his readers vnderſtand, that they ſignifie nothing, but common matter, and he expects, that ſome will thinke Engliſh, and ſaleable Divinitie of no regard, though they vnderſtand no other.

But he proceedes ſuch a kinde of *Pſalmaſtry, or other verball devotion, without ſuteable deedes, cannot perſwade any of Zeale, and righteouſnes in the perſon.*

But ſuch, as make Pſalmaſtrie a word of contempt, reliſh not the Zeale of the ſweete ſinger of Iſraell, and their deedes are odious to all good men, that ſeeke matter of reproach vpon the devotions of others, and make their malitious ſurmiſes poſitive truths. The inſtances *of Tyrants* counterfeiting Religion are frequent, and that hipocriſie is inſeperable from Tyrants, by vſurpation ſuch as this libellers Maſters, whoſe want of right, ſeekes protection from diſſembled vertue, but this ſeldome happens to Kings by juſt Title, whoſe power wants not that ſupport. His comparing his late Majeſt: to knowne vſurpers, that confirmed their Crownes, gained by robbery, and kept with falſhood, & blood ſhewes his odious ſhameleſſnes in the diſſimititude, & whoever obſerves the prophane aſſumption of the Titles of pietie, by theſe Monſters, & their hipocriticall profeſſions, to maske their wicked ends, ſhall finde, that *Andronicus Comnenus*, and our Engliſh *Rich. 3.* Came ſhort of them, not only in counterfeiting Religion, and conſcience, but in falſhood, and crueltie. Inſteede of *ſhake ſpeares* ſcene *of Rich. 3.* The libeller may take the Parliaments declaration of the 29. May, where their words are. *The providing for the publique peace, and proſperitie of his Majeſt: and all his Realmes, we proteſt in the preſence of the all-ſeeing Deitie to have been, and ſtill to be, the only end of all our Councells, & endeavours, wherein wee have reſolved to continue freed, and enlarged from all private aimes, perſonall reſpects, or paſſions whatſoever, and againe in their petition of* the ſecond of June, they tell him, *that they have nothing in their thoughts, and deſires more pretious, and of higher eſteeme next to the honour, and immediate ſervice of God, then the juſt, and faithfull performance of their dutie to his Majeſt:* and

the libeller will not finde in hiſtorie, or poet words of a deeper hipocriſie in the mouth of a villaine, nor more contradicted by their Actions. That which he adds from his Teſtimony out of ſhakeſpeare of the imagined vehemence *of Rich. the 3.* In his diſſembled profeſſions, holds noe proportion with, theis hipocriſies, really acted, not fancyed by a poet, and this libeller hath learnt to act a part out of ſhakeſpeare, and with Rich. 3. accuſing loyaltie, and innocency for high Crymes, and crying out againſt their wickednes, that ſought to reſtore the diſpoſeſſed heires of the Crowne to their right, and amplifying their offence, as the higheſt againſt God, and man, and wherein comes the libeller ſhort of his patterne in this ſcene.

He ſayes *heerein the worſt of Kings profeſſing Chriſtianiſme have by farr exceeded him*, and he gives his reaſon, *for that the King hath, as it were vnhallowed, and vnchriſtned by borrowing to a Chriſtian vſe prayers offred to a heathen God.*

And doth ſaint Paul exceede the worſt of Kings profeſſing Chriſtianiſme by borrowing to a Chriſtian vſe the words of an heathen Philoſopher, and poet, did he thereby vnhallow, and vnchriſten Scripture?

His meaning is, as followes afterward, that the King vſed a prayer taken out of S. Philip Sydnies Arcadia. After the firſt Edition of his Majeſt: booke, the Printers finding the greate vent of them, in the following Editions Printed prayers, and other things in the Kings name, not belonging to the booke. Among theſe prayers, there is a prayer taken out of the Arcadia. That prayer is neither made by a heathen, woman, nor to a heathen God, but is compoſed by the Author a Chriſtian without reference to any heathen Deitie, and the Author is not thought to vnchriſten prayer by it, the libeller himſelfe ſaying the booke in its kinde is full of worth, and wit, but as his outcry hath noe cauſe from the matter, ſo heere is no evidence of the fact, that his Majeſt: made vſe of that prayer, or popt into the Biſhopps hands as a relique of his exerciſe, though he might warrantably have vſed it and profeſſed it.

But he goes on to ſhew what he can ſay vpon this occaſion. *Who would have imagined ſo litle feare in him of the true alſeeing Deitie, ſo litle reverence of the holy Ghoſt, whoſe office is to dictate, and preſent our Chriſtian prayers, ſo litle care of truth in his laſt words, or honour to himſelfe, or to his friends, or ſenſe of his afflictions, or of that ſad hower, which was vpon him, as immediately before his death to pop into the hand of that grave Biſhopps, who attended him, as a ſpeciall relique of his ſaintly exerciſes a prayer ſtolne, &c.*

All men, that have obſerved this Authors practice hitherto reſt aſſured, that he hath ſo litle feare, or reverence of the allſeeing Deitie, ſo litle care of truth, or honour, as he ſtickes not to charge his Majeſt: with facts neverdone, and innocent Actions, with tranſcendent guilt. If his Majeſt: had vſed the prayer, or delivered it, as he imagines, no

man

man of Christian ſobrietie could charge the fact with Cryme, what one word, or ſentence is there in that prayer, which a Chriſtian may not vſe, but the Image breaker hath a greate quarrel to al formes of prayer, and by the reaſon he produces, that the office of *the holy Ghoſt is to dictate, and preſent our Chriſtian prayers*, all ſet prayers want reverence to the holy Ghoſt, ſo tender is he of the beſt reformed Churchs, of whome he ſo often makes a propertie. And whence concludes he no care of truth in his laſt words, when the King never ſpake of it. He aggravates this fact by the perſon of the graye Biſhopp, who had been a Prelaticall leiturgiſt, had it not been to paint a ſlander. The laughter, which he conceives is cauſed by the thought of this, *that he, which acted ſo Tragically ſhould have ſuch a ridiculous exit* might rather ſtrike horrour in the libeller, for his malitious oppoſition to truth, that will ſo contrary to his owne knowledge charge him to act tragically, that had governed ſo mildly, and to have a ridiculous exit, that left the world with ſo greate pietie, and ſuch vniverſall greife of the people for his ſufferings, but deſperate wretches laugh at the wickednes they act. His Majeſt: friends have had good experience, that his Enemies, who have ſpared no paines to traduce him, would not forbeare any occaſion of detraction. His Majeſt: enduring afflictions with admired patience, his ſuffering death with Chriſtian fortitude, his vertuous life, & holy Martyrdome, cannot be blaſted by an Atheiſts ſcorne, nor a Rebells malice.

His concluſion in the begging of the queſtion, *that it is cleere the King was not induced, but conſtrained to call the laſt Parliament*, which by his owne ſhewing is apparently falſe, for if there had been ſuch a conſtraint, the Lords in vaine petitioned, and all the neceſſities, that he hath ſuppoſed may concurr with the Kings inclination to call a Parliament, and if neceſſitie had conſtrained him to call a Parliament, what ſhould hinder, but *he might avouch in the eares of God, that he did it with an vpright intention to his glory, and his peoples good.* If neceſſitie of his peoples preſervation, or welfare cauſe him to call a Parliament, may he not vſe theſe words; Whence would the Image breaker have it a cauſe of trembling, more, then any thing ſpoken in the preſence of God. The permitting mans wickednes is no approbation of it, nor a token of his hatred to thoſe, that are afflicted by it. There are ſome, whome God hath given over to deluſion, and of that the libeller appeares to have a greate meaſure, who not only beleives lies, but is the Author of them, making the names of Religion, and conſcience, and the feare of God baites to deceive, and venom to reproach

ΕΙΚΩΝ ΑΚΛΑΣΤΟΣ

Vpon the

EARLE

of

STRAFFORDS DEATH.

THis chapter he ſayes is *a penitent confeſſion of the King, and the ſtrangeſt, if it be well weigbed, that ever was auricular, for he repents heere of giving his conſent, though moſt vnwillingly to the moſt ſeaſonable, and ſolemne peice of Iuſtice, that had been done of many yeares in the land: But his ſole conſcience thought the contrary.*

Impieties that were ſtrange heeretofore, are common with this libeller, and it is vnheard of that repentance of an act conceiveded ſinfull by the athour, was reproached by any before this Atheiſt, he never weighed neither repentance, nor confeſſion, if he had, he would never have thought it ſtrange, that his Majeſt: ſhould confeſſe, that he ſinned in following a multitude to doe evill, and if the murther of the Earle of ſtrafford had been Juſtice, is it ſtrange, that ſuch, as had acted in it without ſufficient ſatiſfaction to their conſcienc, ſhould confeſſe their ſin in concurring to ſuch an Action? Was it not an injuſtice, that was done vnwillingly, and ought it not to be repented of? If his Majeſt: ſole conſcience thought the contrary, was it not ſin in him to conſent to the fact, and is it without experience, that a ſingle man in an Aſſembly hath judged the right, and the reſt proceeded in the wrong, but he applies himſelfe to readers, whoſe affections, and capacities, are proportioned to his expreſſions, and therefore his Majeſt: confeſſion is the ſtrangeſt, that ever was auricular. He would have them beleive, that his Majeſt: diſcourſe in this Chapter was popiſh auricular confeſſion, els his Jnigly of auricular, had no congruitie with a written confeſſion. For the merit of that, which he calls ſolemne peice of Juſtice, no age had produced ſuch a ſolemne, and formall peice of villany, which is by ſo much more odious, as it had the figures of law, and Juſtice.

And

And thus was the welfare, the ſafetie, and within a litle the vnannimous demaund of three populous nations, to have attended ſtill on the Singularitie of one mans opinionated conſcience, if men had allwayes been ſo tame, and ſpiritles, and had not vnexpectedly found the grace to vnderſtand, that if his conſcience were ſo narrow, and peculiar to it ſelfe, it was not fit, his authoritie ſhould be ſo ample, and vniverſall over others, for certainly a private conſcience, ſortes not with a publique calling.

The welfare, and ſafetie of theſe three populous Kingdomes, had been probably preſerved, if they had attended on his Maj: conſcience, and what hath been the conſequence of that ſpirit, and grace, which he ſayes they found, and was indeede the infuſion of impious inclinations into many by the ſpirit of errour, & diſobedience, but the moſt deſperate, & languishing miſerie, & danger, that ever lay vpon the Kingdome. And theſe graceles miſcreants ſport at the nam af grace, & prophane the profeſſion of it. He would be vnderſtood a litle modeſt in adding with in a litle to vnannimous, but being weighed, his impudence wil appeare litle leſſe in this, then former paſſages. If the three Kingdomes be conſidered in compariſon to that ſmall number, that vnderſtood the caſe of the Earle of Strafford, it was a very litle part of the Kingdomes, that made the demaund he mentions, & if he would advantage his cauſe by the cryes of thoſe, that were ſtirred vp by the Seditious Seducers, to cry Juſtice, their giddy wilfullnes, aſwel, as ignorance, & lewdenes, wil add litle to the weight, though it encreas the number of theſe demaunders. But this man thinkes conſcience vnfitt for a King, & therefore would not have ſo narrow a conſcience have ſo large an authority, for he ſayes a private conſcience ſorts not with a publique calling, & declares that perſon rather meant by nature for a private fortune. The muſt profeſt Atheiſts, & looſe debauches, never avowed a greater ſcorne of Chriſtianitie, neither is there an Author extant, that hath adventured ſo farr vpon the reaſons of men, as to complaine vpon a King for Tyrany, and errours in Religion, & with the ſame breath, charging him with vnfitnes to be a King, for want of a wide conſcience. Theſe mē are true to their principles, to make vehement profeſſions of Religion, though they hate it, and in the middeſt of their prophane faſts, & preſumptuous thankes giving, they jeere at al Religion, & conſcience, & profeſſe to the world, that a publique conſcience ought not to be narrow, nor ſticke at any thing, & as their conſcience is, ſo is their practice, & they, that made no conſcienc of their loyalty, mak no conſcienc of exerciſing their power.

He, whoſe conſcience thinkes it ſin, to putt to death a Capitall offender, will as oft thinke it meritorious, to kill a righteous perſon.

If his Majeſt: had thought the Earle of Strafford, a Capital offender, he had made no conſcience of his death, and this libeller vainely ſuppoſes conſcience of ſin, to put to death a Capital offender, which cannot conſiſt, with a conſcience ſo informed, neither doth an erroneous

conſcience in ſparing blood, as oft thinke it meritorious to kill vndeſervedly, though it be nothing to the preſent purpoſe, for he can faſten neither vpon his Majeſt: conſcience of ſparing a Capitall offender, or killing a righteous perſon. But in this whereof he repents.

That the ſin of ſigning the Bill of ſtraffords execution, he would not have matter to trouble the Kings conſcience, and his reaſons are, *That all men looked vpon him, as one of the moſt impetuous inſtruments to advance any illegall deſigne.*

The Earle of ſtrafford was a man, that the Seditious diſturbers of the ſtate hated, and feared, and ſought, vnderhand to rayſe the malevolence of others againſt him. If any men have ſo farr loſt reaſon, as to meaſure the Miniſters of Kings by the libells of Traytours, they are likely to take the beſt men for moſt guiltie, and if a King ſhould ſacrifice his faithfull Servants, becauſe they are not looked vpon with a good eye by the multitude, he may not expect to be ſerved by men of fidelitie, or merit, and we have ſeene, how the peoples lookes have been won, and loſt.

That he had rul'd Ireland, & ſome part of England in an Arbitrary manner.

The word. Arbitrary in the beginning of the late Parliament was vſed to ſcare the people, and made to ſignifie greate affrightments to them, but that bugbeare is now growne rediculous to children, for all men ſee, that in all places of Government much is left Arbitrary to the Governour, and it was evident to the world, that the Earle of ſtrafford did nothing in an Arbitrary manner, without Preſident of his Predeceſſours, and the Judges in Courts of equitie, might be aſwell made Cryminall for proceeding in an Arbitrary manner as he. That he had endeavoured to ſubvert fundamentall lawes was a ſuppoſition, not a fact, and if the Image breaker looke over the Articles, where with he was charged at his Tryall, he will finde nothing of ſuch a Cryme. *To ſubvert Parliaments, and incenſe the King, againſt them* was not as much, as vrged againſt him at his Tryall, that Article being declined by his accuſers in regard of knowne falſhood, and that the Earle of ſtrafford adviſed the King, to call the former Parliament. *That he had endeavoured to make hiſtolitie betweene England, and ſcotland* was a legend deviſed for vulgar temper, not rationall couſideration, for both Kingdomes being vnder one King, they muſt be Rebells in either Kingdome, that make warr againſt one another without him, and what dreamer can fancy that any Miniſter of ſtate, that were affected to the Kings deſignes, as this libeller ſuppoſes the Earle of ſtrafford to be, would ſtirr vp hoſtilitie betweene the nations. They have not yet adventured to charge the Earle of ſtrafford with ſtirring vp the ſcotch hoſtilitie, and if he endeavoured to reſiſt them, is that *to make hoſtolitie be tweene the nations*, It hath been the practice of theſe Rebells to ſtile men incendiaries, and malignants, that oppoſed their Rebellion, and ſuch evill

Coun-

Counſellours that adviſed any courſe to prevent their attemps,and the following confuſion but though this vaine deluſion were caſt abroade among the people, it was never offred, as a charge againſt the Earle.

That he had councelled the King, to call over that Iriſh Army of Papiſts, which he had cunningly rayſed to reduce England, as appeared by good Teſtimony then preſent at the conſultation, is vnſeaſonably remembred by the libeller after thoſe Rebells, whome he ſerves, have ſeverall times drawne in forraigne Armies into England,reduced the nation to ſerve an vſurped power,ſet vp an Arbitrary Government,ſubverted the fundamentall lawes, and deſtroyed both King, and Parliament. It may aſtoniſh Knowing men to reade this Author,objecting Capitall offences to the Earle of ſtrafford,and numbring vp for inſtance the ſame Actions himſelfe defends: ſoe as it cannot be an humane errour, but helliſh-fury, that hurles him into ſuch mad contradictions, and its worth the obſerving,that to this particular he adds, as appeared by good Teſtimony then preſent at the conſultation, well Knowing,that the Teſtimony was not only ſingle,but ſubject to moſt juſt,and apparent exception in regard of knowne enmitie, and former prevarication in ſeverall examinations vpon oath, and it no way helpes a falſe Teſtimonie, that he knew the truth, or that he was preſent at a fact, whereof he makes an vntrue relation,and if the Earle of ſtrafford had councelled the King to make vſe of the Iriſh Army in either Kingdome in caſe of Rebellion, how comes that to be an offence, though that was not the truth, that he ſpake of England, nor the Army rayſed againſt England, and is it a commendable cunning,to rayſe an Army againſt a Rebellion.

His reference to 28 *Articles* directs vs how to know, that he truſts on number more then weight, and thoſe Articles remaine a Teſtimonie to poſteritie of the ridiculous pretences which effected ſuch miſcheife. He ſayth *the Commons by farr the greater number caſt him*, and yet is ſo abſurdly impudent to charge the King with ſingularitie of conſcience, and alledge preſently a part of the lower houſe of the ſame opinion. *The Lords*, he ſayth, *after they had been ſatisfied in a full diſcourſe by the Kings ſolicitour,and the opinions of many Iudges delivered in their houſe agreed likewiſe to the ſentence of Treaſon.* Thoſe Lords, that condemned the Earle of ſtrafford,might be ſatisfied by terrour of the Tumults,and their owne corrupt paſſions,never by law,nor reaſon. Its well knowne, that the Lords,and Commons were aſſaulted,and threatned by the vnruly rabble of the Citie,and Suburbs, if they condemned him not,they had not freedome in their coming, or going to the houſe, or ſitting there. There was no one judge, that gave his opinion for the ſentence againſt him, and the Sollicitours diſcourſe was very ſtrong againſt the preſent Rebells,wholy impertinent to the caſe of the Earle of ſtrafford, and ſhewed his owne deceite, and the ſottiſhnes of them, that relyed on what they vnderſtood not. Diverſe lords for ſooke the houſe having

not

not libertie to be preſent, ſoe farr were the lords from being ſatiſfied. That which he calls a ſentence of Treaſon, was an act of power, it being a Bill to take away his life, but an exception of all men els, from being proceeded againſt for the ſame matters, in ordinary Juſtice, and this very Action, ſoe ſcandalous in it ſelfe, and ſoe greivous to many, that conſented to it, muſt be dreſt out with a ſhameleſſe commendation, to accuſe the King, for his repentance of a fact, which ſoe much afflicted him. *That the people vniverſally cryed for juſtice* is noe wonder, if we conſider former examples, and they had a Preſident in the people of the Iewes, that cryed Crucifie. If we beleive this libeller, telling vs how light, and violent, they are in their motions, or if we looke vpon the acts of a powerfull faction, then prevayling with them, that could eaſily make them cry, what was put in their mouth, we may eaſily judge the injuſtice of their cry, and their ignorance of the cauſe, and a ſober author would have hated, to borrow an Argument of Juſtice, from popular outcryes, which are the moſt evident proofe of injuſtice, and oppreſſion of innocence.

He ſayes *none were his friends, but Courtiers, and Clergimen, the worſt at that time, and moſt corrupted ſort of men, & Court ladies, not the beſt of women.*

His fer friends, and many Enemies, render the proceedings againſt him more, then ſuſpected, and men may eaſily beleive, that in ſuch a condition furie was the accuſer, and malice, and cowardiſe the judge. The confining his friends to Court, and Church, is the effect of the libellers engagement to ſchiſme, and Rebellion, who holds ſuch loyaltie, and affection to the King, and conſcientious reverence to the Church, for the markes of greate offenders. If multitude of Ennemies be a Teſtimony of guilt, the beſt men will become the worſt of ſinners. But having noe friends, as he ſayes, it adds much to the right of his cauſe, that ſoe many who were neither Courtiers, nor Clergymen, nor any way obliged by him, or the Court, ſhould in diſcharge of their conſcienc declare their diſſent to that bloody law, though they were thereby objected to popular fury. His impertinent rayling at Courtiers, and Clergymen argues his malice, not Cryme in them. His mention of Court ladies was for want of matter, and their activitie in ſtate affaires belongs not to this occaſion.

The King declared to both houſes, that noe feares, or reſpects what ſo ever, ſhould make him alter that reſolution, founded vpon his conſcience, and ſayes either then his reſolution, was not founded vpon his conſcience, or his conſcience recieved better information, or both ſtrucke ſayle, for within few dayes after, fower of his Biſhopps pickt the thorne out of his conſcience, and he was perſwaded to ſigne the Bill.

Men, that are ſincere often fall, but ſuch never have conſciencie, nor ſinceritie, that jeere at it, and make the falls of men, and their wounds of conſcience matter of their mirth. Though his Majeſt: did that, which

which he had formerly profeſſed to be againſt his conſcience, could he not repent of that frailetie of falling from his reſolution? Or might he not afterwards diſcover the errours of thoſe reaſons, that induced him to it? If feares were any motive to what he did, the curſe lies on them, that cauſed it, and on them, that reproach him with it. Poets have not fancied a higher degree of wickednes in fends of hel, then in their malitious glory of compelling others to ſin, and reproaching their repentance for ſin. Experience hath repreſented his Majeſt: fortitude, and that not his perſonall feares, but his apprehenſion of the Kingdomes miſerie wrought moſt on his paſſion, and wee cannot finde Parallell expreſſions to thoſe of this libeller in his Scoffes at conſcience, and picking the thorne out of it, vnles amongſt thoſe deſperate, and prophane Atheiſts, that make it the higheſt pitch of wit to render things ſacred moſt ridiculous.

Perhapps, it wrung his conſcience to condemne the Earle, not becauſe he thought him guiltles, had halfe theſe Crymes been committed againſt his perſonall intereſt, as appeared by his charge againſt the ſix members, but becauſe he was principall, and the Earle but acceſſory, and thought nothing Treaſon againſt the Common wealth, but againſt himſelfe only.

Playing with conſcience he cannot part with, whoſe owne is inſenſible. In thoſe particulars he hath rehearſed againſt the Earle of Strafford, no one of them could be charged vpon the King, and the nature of moſt of the Articles coud not admit a ſuppoſition of the Kings activitie in them. The charge againſt the ſix members conteyned matter of direct Treaſon againſt knowne lawes, & his Majeſt: cannot be ſuppoſed to thinke the Earle of Strafford guiltie, becauſe he charged the ſix members, with ſome offences laid to the charge of the Earle of Strafford, but never proved, yet it was an infamous injuſtice of them that ſo violently proceeded againſt the Earle of Strafford, and would not admitt an accuſation for the ſame offences againſt others. If his Majeſt: thought, that noe Treaſon could be committed, but againſt himſelfe, he thought no otherwiſe then the law hath provided, & the accuſers of the Earle of Strafford maintained at his Tryall. And the libeller muſt checke himſelfe for his imagination of Treaſon againſt the Common wealth, which had not a being, vnles he wil make a Treaſon by Propheſie, & antedate his ordinance. He well knowes England was a Monarchy, and that his Maſters profeſſe the change of it into a ſuppoſed free ſtate. Theis Traytours, that would imagine ſome Treaſon againſt the King are come to affirme, that there are no Treaſons againſt the King, for they are ſure they have committed all, that concerne his perſon. His impertinency is very tedious in demaunding, why the King ſhould ſeeme ſatisfied to ſigne the Bill by thoſe *Iudges, and Ghoſtly Fathers*, as he calls them, *of his owne chuſing, and now pretend, that it was the importunities of ſome, and feare of others made him ſigne.*

He does not produce any Teſtimony, that the King profeſſed himſelfe ſatisfied, or had he been ſatisfied, it was no barr to his future information, & repentance, but an inſtance can hardly be produced, that ever any mans repentance of a knowne fact was traduced, or ſcorn'd by any, before this libeller, & he might aſwel jeere at many famous ſaints, and Martyrs, that fell from their reſolutions, and after recovered, as at his Majeſt: And *the picking out of his thorne, ſtriking ſayle to his feare, and a fleeting conſcience*, may vpon the ſame grounds be the moſt eminent penitents in the Church of God. To make his Calumnies ſticke, he ſayes. *That his Majeſt: enſuing Actions declare he could diſſemble ſatisfaction, for that he had the cheife hand in a conſpiracie againſt the Parliament, and Kingdome.* How the King could conſpire againſt his Kingdome, or what ſhould be his end is not intelligible, & when a King is traduced by Rebells for a conſpiracy againſt the Parliament, and Kingdome, no men of common reaſon can receive ſuch a palpable fiction, but this greate conſpiracy, which he ſayes *came to light by the examinations of Percy, Goring, and others was to reſcue the Earle of Strafford by ſeizing the tower of London, to bring vp the Engliſh Army from the north, joynd with eight thouſand Iriſh Papiſts rayſ'd by Strafford, & a french Army to be landed at Portsmouth againſt the Parliament, and their friends.* And where is the offence in all this, if it were true, and a powerfull faction aſſume the name of Parliament? No wiſe man will blame the King, if he had done ſuch an Action to prevent the miſeries, which he foreſaw, and the Deſignes, that were plotted againſt him, but this ſtory is now ſtale, though it then ſerved the turne to diſtemper the people. The examinations, which he ſpeakes of, doe not yet charge the King with the knowledge of this deſigne, but the readers of Iconoclaſtes muſt be of miraculous ſtupiditie, if they thinke it a Cryme in the King to intend the bringing vp of his Army from the north, or any other force, and thinke it lawfull for the Rebells againſt him to bring vp their Army againſt the Parliament, and plucke them out of the houſe. Was not the Tower of London allwayes in the Kings poſſeſſion, and might he not make it good againſt Traytours.

For which purpoſe he ſayes *the King though requeſted by both houſes refuſed to disband thoſe Iriſh Papiſts.* Though there were many reaſons, why his Majeſt: refuſed to disband the Iriſh, and the requeſt of the houſes were a vote conſtrained by Tumults, not the reſult of a free debate, yet had it been ſo, that his Majeſt: had refuſed to disband them to prevent the plots of the Trayterous faction in Parliament, he had juſt reaſon to doe it. And as the Religion men profeſſe, though true, doth not priviledge them from offending, though they are thereby a ſcandall to their profeſſion: So Iriſh Papiſts, or any others of contrary Religion may be imployed againſt ſuch, as have ſtained their profeſſion by ſuch Actions. Theſe Rebels ſought ſhelter from their Religion for their Treaſon,

ſon,& perſwaded the people of their ſinceritie, becauſe Papiſts fought againſt them, but it was in truth their infamy, that gave the reaſon,and the frequent repetition of Iriſh Papiſts ſhewes,that it is a ſtale to misleade the weakeſt capacities, that can only ſuſpect, not prove, nor deſcerne.

He concludes *the King as Criminous, as the Earle*, and therefore he ſayes, *inſteed of deteſting his ambition, evill Councell, violence, and oppreſſion of the people, he falls to prayſe his greate abilities.*

It had been a Kinde of ſlander to forbeare the due commendation of ſuch abilities, as all men admired, and an vnexcuſable injuſtice to reproach the memory of the innocent with the falſe accuſations of malicious Enemyes. If his Majeſt: had recounted any faults of the Earle, it had byn no ſatiſfaction to his conſcience for conſenting to his death, but it had been a ſigne of an vnſound minde to ſeeke matter of excuſe for an illegall ſentence from the diſpoſition of the ſuffering partie, and ſuch Actions, as the law had not made the merit of ſuch a ſentence. The world is well informed now, that thoſe Rebells account the due performance of juſt authoritie violence, and oppreſſion, and that their cheiſe hatred againſt the Earle of Strafford was for his fidelitie to king, and Kingdome, and his oppoſition of Rebellion his evill Councell.

That beneath the decency of a King, he compares him to the ſun which in all figurative vſe beares alluſion to a King, not to a ſubject.

If ſuch be the Kingly Prerogative, that the ſun beares alluſion only to Kings, not to ſubjects,then muſt this libeller confeſſe himſelfe to be of that ſordid generation,which by that influence are rayſed out of ſinkes,and puddles to obſcure that gloryous luſter, and his obſervation of this alluſion might juſtly make him reflect vpon himſelfe with deteſtation contending againſt ſuch cleere light,and ſlandring truth it ſelfe. But vertue in other perſons beſides Kings hath been ſet foorth by alluſion to the ſun,and his triviall exception at the decency of that alluſion ſhewes him as inſignificant, as will full.

He hath a conceite,that the *King Knitts contradictions as cloſe,as words can lie togeather, not approving in his judgment, and yet approving in his ſubſequent reaſon,all that Stafford did, as driven by the neceſſitie of times,and the temper of that people* The Kings words are, *I cannot in my judgment approve all he did, driven it may be by the neceſſitie of times* &c. And let the reader judge, whether this libellers falſification be not Knit,as cloſe,as words can lie togeather, and its like he knew it by his impertinent vſe of the Phraſe cloſe Knit to his ſuppoſed contradictions. Though the King juſtly excuſed ſome things, which he could not approve, doth he therefore approve all,and doth the libeller thinke,that what a man cannot approve, he muſt thinke inexcuſable, and that Circumſtances doe not alter the qualitie of Actions?

But he ſayes *it is the marvell, and may be the aſtoniſhment of all,that have*

a conſcience, how he durſt with the ſame words of contrition, wherewith David repented the murthering of Vriah, repent his lawfull compliance to that juſt Act.

It is noe marvell to men, that know theis Rebells, though heeretofore it might have been the aſtoniſhment of all, that ſuch ſhould offer to perſwade others of their eſteeme of conſcience, that make it their common ſcoffe, and while this libeller, charges the King with no leſſe then murder in conſenting vnwillingly, and conſequently in him to an vnjuſt ſentence, makes an exclamation, why he ſhould repent in Davids words for the like Cryme. The libeller well knowes, that if it had been to a lawfull ſentence of condemnation, yet blood guiltines lies, where conſent with the tongue, had not the perſwaſion of the heart, & when the King, thought blood lay on him, ſhould he thinke to hide his ſin from God? & this prophane Sectary wonders a ſinner durſt repent. Theſe miſcreants are loath to behold their murders in thoſe bloody colours, which the truth of God gives them, & therefore they wil call that Act juſt againſt the cry of their Conſciences, as they ſtirred vp the people to cry juſtice without knowledge of the fact.

It would have taken much from the heavines of his ſin to have told God in his confeſſion, how he laboured, what darke plots he had contrived, into what a League entred, and with what conſpiratours againſt his Parliament, & Kingdome to reſcue ſo notable an inſtrument, &c.

Doubtles the King would have taken that courſe, if he could have charg'd himſelfe with any ſinfull labour in that kinde. That he ought to have vſed all his power, and ſkill to have reſcued that Earle, was his dutie to God, and a perſon ſo cruelly, & ſhameleſſely oppreſſed; And all men know what falſe feares were pretended, what ridiculous plots were imagined to diſorder the people, and when there is ſuch apparent diſcovery of Trayterous plots, and ſuch avowing of Trayterous Actions, there can be none ſo infatuated to beleive, that all neceſſary prevention of ſuch wicked deſignes was not to withſtand the ruine of the Parliament, and Kingdome.

It was feare, which made him fayne both the ſcruple, and the ſatiſfaction. And what feare could make him fayne a ſcruple, whome could he feare, if he had not ſcrupled, but God only? and where doth it appeare, that he fayned ſatisfaction, but its the libellers want of the fear of God, and men, that makes him thus feareles of ſlandering, and contradicting.

Repentance came not on him, till a long time after, when he ſaw, he could have ſuffred nothing more, though he had denyed the Bill.

Though the King ſay, *he could have ſuffred nothing more, though he had denyed the Bill*, he never finds, that repentance came not from him till long after, but knew very well, his repentance followed the fact cloſe at the heeles.

He aſkes a queſtion, *how he could underſtandingly repent of letting that*

be

be Treaſon, which the Parliament, and whole nation ſo judged. He hath already told vs it was al moſt the whole nation, and the greater part of the Parliament, but he finds now, that any diminution induces doubt, and it muſt be the Parliament, and whole nation. May not a man vnderſtandingly repent, becauſe the whole nation was in the ſame fault? how many Acts of Parliament have been made, whereof it had been happy for King, and people, they had repented? there neede not an enumeration in ſo Knowne a truth.

It was a worldly repentance, not a conſciencious, or els a ſtrange Tyranny, which his conſcience had got over him to vex him like an evill ſpirit for doing one act of Iuſtice to forteſie his reſolution from ever doing ſo any more.

We may ſee what account this man makes of ſin, or conſcience, that thus derides the terrours of conſcience. We may beleive their conſciences cauterized, that are ſuch ſtrangers to vexations of conſcience, and that ſin, and Rebellion have got a ſtrange Maſtery of them, that fortifies their reſolutions againſt all repentance, and the approbation of it in others. This libeller cannot perſwade himſelfe, that when he calls murther Juſtice, and Rebellion loyaltie, that he is beleived, though he profeſſe *admiration*, that men *diſreliſh* thoſe his prime qualities, and makes the execration of ſuch wickednes to be *ſtrange infatuation*, and *hardnes of heart*, and ſo calls the Kings vnwilling, and forced conſent to an act, he judged evill, *the taſting of a juſt deede*, and his repentance for it, he calls *ſpattring at it*. The Devills are tormented with the repentance of others, and their Agents blaſphemouſly deride it, and its doubtfull, whether the pittie, or deteſtation ought to be greater to wards ſuch deſperate perſons, that call the conſent to an execrable murder, *taſting of one good deede*, and the reſolution againſt the like *ſpattring at it*, no doubt this man ſpatters at conſcience, & direliſhes all repentance, nothing being ſo naturall to him, as the oppoſition to pietie.

That wo is denounced to the Scribes, and Phariſees for ſtraining at a gnat, and ſwallowing a Cammell. We ſcarcely finde ſo greate a Cammel ſwallowed by the Scribes, and Phariſees, as many, that are greedily devoured by this libeller. His prophane, and malitious ſcornes, and reproaches of repentance in this very ſection, and magnifying an execrable Murther are Cammells in the Jugdment of true Chriſtians, though it ſeeme not ſo to that ſenſe, which is wholy reprobate, the ſtraining at gnats, and ſwallowing Cammels was never more apparent in any ſect of men, then this libeller, and his crew, and if the *ruine of three Kingdomes be ſoe big, & bulky*, as he confeſſes, and would falſely have to be the deedes of his late Majeſt: and that a wo belongs to them, what may this libeller, & his Complices expect, that have ſtrained at formes, and Ceremonies, & ſwallowed downe not only periuries, and Murthers, the defence of odious ſins, and the reproaching of Chriſtian duties, but have vndoubtedly brought this ruine vpon his Majeſt: three Kingdomes.

He followes his common place of reproaching his Majeſt: conſcience, and ſayes, *if it were come to that vnnaturall diſtraſie to digeſt poyſon, it was not for his Parliament, and Kingdomes to feede with him any longer.* This Chapter the libeller hath compoſed for a ſatyre againſt conſcience to make it more a bhord by his crew of Caniballs, with whome none can feede, but blood thirſtie ſavages. Could he name a greater diſcraſie then what he commends, that confines conſcience to ſhed blood, exludes it from ſparing. Theſe Traytours had made falſhood, and diſobedience unnaturall to them, and thereby they cauſed ſuch, as ſought to preſerve themſelves from that peſtilence, to avoyde them, & thoſe venemous perſons according to their malitious qualitie ſought to infect with their diſpoſition, or deſtroy by their rage all that came neere them, or reſtrained their Company.

That the King would perſwade vs, that the Parliament eſcaped not ſome touches of remorſe for putting Strafford to death in forbidding it to be a Preſident for the future; but he ſayes *in faire conſtruction that act implyed rather a deſire to pacifie the Kings minde, not imagining, that this after Act ſhould be retorted on them, whether it were made a Preſident, or not, no more then the want of a Preſident for this.*

Its ſome what ſtrange, that the Image breaker finding his rigour only to rayle would medle with this Argument, but it ſeemes he apprehended the hope of a fallacie in the word after, & would inſinuate, that this Act was made after the murther, which was made to authoriſe it, and in a *faire conſtruction* it hath not the leaſt ſhadow of a deſire to *pacifie the King*, for it did not diminiſh any of their power, or purpoſes, that contrived that Act, but only to exclude this fact from ordinary Juſtice, which in a *faire conſtruction implyes*, that it was not law, but will, and power, whereby they proceeded. The truth was themſelves ſaw, that by the conſequence of that fact of theirs, all mens lives, and fortunes were expoſed to danger, and ruine, and no Magiſtrate, or officer, but might be drawne within the compaſſe of *Treaſon*, by the Rules they had held with the Earle of Strafford, & all they, that were preſent at the debates of that buſnies know well, that their proper feares cauſed that proviſion in the Act, and though themſelves were not bound to Preſidents, they were affraid, that others would follow their *Preſidents*, as in truth they ought, if this Preſident had been according to law. He would not have, that this Act argued in the Parliament, *their leaſt repenting, when it argued ſo litle in the King, who accuſed the ſix members for the ſame Crymes, which he would not thinke treaſonable in the Earle.*

The accuſation of thoſe ſix members was of other, and higher Crymes, beſides ſome of thoſe objected to the Earle of Strafford, and vpon better grounds, and if it had been only thoſe it ſhewes apparently, that they, that would not proceede vpon that accuſation, repented of what they had done againſt the Earle of Strafford, or had no conſcience at all,

all, but were only guided by corrupt reſpects of perſon, and intereſt, and his Majeſt: might try what they would doe againſt perſons evidently guiltie of that, which they had judged ſo high a Cryme in another. For the diſcovery of their former falſe proceedings; *that the King held nothing Treaſon, but againſt himſelfe.* He hath been already told, was the judgment of the accuſers of the Earle of Strafford, and he might have knowne it to be ſo farr from a *Tyranicall principle*, as he calls it, that it is the rule of law, and Government, for have not his Maſters changed the ſtile of proceedings againſt offenders, which the law formerly vſed in regard of their change of Government, and deviſed one according to their new modell? Its poſſible they, that deviſed that clauſe in the Act, did not expect, it would be retorted vpon them, they were blinded with their fury, and precipitation. But the Image breaker might have obſerved, that a greater evidence of their injuſtice could not have been provided. He that is ſo ſhameleſſe to inſinuate the *Kings inſtigation* to that clauſe in the Act for the death of the Earle Strafford, which were a madnes in any man to ſuppoſe, may aſwell pretend it for his death. The ſix members muſt ſtand condemned, if he acquit them, for the contrary of what he affirmes is conſtantly true. And it were folly to aſke him, why he ſhould conclude the ſix members guiltles, that never were tryed, when they were accuſed of ſuch facts, as he himſelfe ſayes were Treaſon in others, for he will certainly ſay it, though he thinke it not.

He concludes againſt the Kings conſcience in ſaying, *that he bare that touch of conſcience with greater regret then any other*, in regard of the *proditory aide* (he ſuppoſes) *ſent to Rochell, and Religion abroade, and a Prodigalitie of ſhedding blood at home* (as he phraſes it.)

There cannot be a greater evidence of the Kings innocence, and the Rebels lewdenes then their abſurd accuſations of him who after their barbarous reproaches, and crueltie make his greateſt Cryme the reſiſtance of their Rebellion, and the misfortune of an expedition in favour of Rochell, and Religion. No man is ſo ſenſeles to beleive that Rochell could have defended it ſelfe without other aide, then their owne, & if the King had not intended their releife, he needed not have vndertaken ſuch chrageable, and dangerous expeditions, & whence can any reaſonable man, collect that the Kings aſſiſtance to them could beproditory, when they were not their by hindred to vſe their vtmoſt endeavours, beſides the Engliſh ſuccours, and heereby wee may ſee how miſerably the people of England have been miſled by hipocriticall Traytours who while they made profeſſion of conſcience and Religion, acted the greateſt villanies againſt Religion and conſcience that the worſt of Atheiſts ever attempted, and ſhame not at ſuch aſſertions of falſhood as common States bluſh to be detected of.

The reaſon he ſayes is worth the notinge, why the King would have notice

notice taken of ſo much tendernes, which is, *he hoped, it would be ſome evidence before God, and man to all poſteritie, that he was farr from bearing that vaſt loade, and guilt of blood laid vpon him by others; which hath (he ſayes) the likenes of a ſubtill diſſimulation.*

When the Prophet David humbled himſelfe, and put on ſackcloth even that was turned to his reproach, and his Majeſt: teares, and afflictions of ſoule are no leſſe reproached by theis vipers, then the greateſt ſins, that could be repented of. Curſed ſhimi will call David a man of blood, and his repentance for the murther of one man with bitternes of ſoule ſhalbe counted a diſſimulation, rather then the wretch will allow it any evidence, that he was innocent of that blood, he would lay to his charge. This was not the firſt time his Majeſt: charged himſelfe with that innocent blood, the Rebells publiſhed his Cabinet, wherein they found it, and he might well hope, that God would cleere his innocence, as the light, and his righteouſnes, as the noone day. Prayers may be made for mercy to a mans name, and a penitent may piouſly hope God will make his repentance evident to men, and his ſorrowes for one ſin, an evidence he was not guiltie of many of the ſame Kinde. His Majeſt: hopes not, that his expreſſions heere wilbe evidence, but that his regretts, which were Knowne not only to God, but men could be evidence, how farr he was from the guilt of what his Enemies charged him with, and to declare a hope of the benifit of repentance is no more like a diſſimulation, then repentance is like a juſtification. If his Majeſt: *had ſhed the blood of thouſands, whome he counted Rebells*, as this Author mentions, he could not ſuffer regretts of conſcience, though he had a ſorrow of heart, his vnderſtanding being ſatiſfied of the Juſtice, and neceſſitie of the fact. But thoſe horrid Traytours, that imbrewed themſelves in the blood of that innocent King, were hardned againſt the ſparing of multitudes, and would ſecure their conſciences by reproaching his Majeſt: repentance, and transferring the blood of warr vpon him, which their Rebellion, and crueltie had ſpilt. This libeller in this very page within few lines told vs, that ſtrafford was by him put to death *vnwillingly* and preſently concludes, thus by *dipping voluntarily the tipp of his finger in the blood of ſtrafford whereof all men cleere him, he thinkes to eſcape that ſea of blood, wherein his owne guilt hath plunged him.*

And may not a mans owne conſcience ſtrike him for that, which all men cleere him of? but that himſelfe hath related to be otherwiſe in this caſe, where ſo many concurred in Judgment againſt the death of the Earle of Strafford, and when ſo many have made confeſſion of their owne vnhappines in the conſent to that Action, and ſo few at preſent, that doe not abhorre it, and thinke it a greate cauſe of Gods diſpleaſure againſt the nation, it is farr from truth, that all men cleere him. The Libeller holds a ſingle murther, but dipping the tip of the finger in blood,

blood, & gives juſt cauſe to conclude, that his conſcience is not toucht with ſhedding a ſea of blood. Al men muſt confeſſe, it a cauſe of greater regret to have his hand in the blood of one man againſt the perſwaſion of his conſcience, then erroneouſly to enter into a warr, where many are diſtroyed vpon the opinion of Juſtice, but the knowne Juſtice of his Majeſt: cauſe, layes the blood of this warr at the Rebells doores, whoſe malice, and Treaſon, not ignorance, or errour drew vpon them the guilt of that blood of Strafford, & thoſe thouſands, which the warr hath devoured. If the King had never publiſhed his repentance for the blood of Strafford, all knowing men would have judged he had cauſe to doe it, and if he had never gone about to purge himſelfe of that blood which the warr had ſhed, all men would have cleered him of it.

Vpon his going to the

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Concerning his vnexcuſable, and hoſtile march from the Court to the houſe of Commons, there needs not much be ſaid.

There neede litle to be ſaid for his Majeſt: defence in going to the houſe of Commons, who had ſo high a provocation to make an hoſtile March, and tooke the way of ſo milde, and peaceable a comming to it, but this Authors impudence in calling it *vnexcuſable* after the many violences, and hoſtile Marches of his Maſters vnto that houſe, and their taking out, and driving away the members will never be excuſed. How ſhameles is this man to call his Majeſt: going to the houſe of Commons with an ordinary guard without Pike, or Muskett an hoſtile March, after the March of a compleate Army led by his Rebell Maſters againſt that houſe. But he vrges for proofe, that his Majeſt: confeſſes it to be *an Act, which moſt men cryed ſhame vpon*, which his Majeſt: ſayes not at all, but *that his Enemies loaded it with obloquy, indifferent men grew jealous of, &*

fearefull, and many of his friends reſented, as a motion riſing rather from paſſion, then reaſon.

The cryes of his Enemies prove nothing, but their owne paſſion, & partialitie, and the jealoſies of men are oftner reſolved into their owne miſtakes, then the truth of Actions. The opinion of his Majeſt: friends condemned not the Action as injurious, though they might thinke it paſſionate, and if this Author could ſet aſide the malice, and corruption of his heart, he might juſtly learne from his Majeſt: cleerenes in ſtating his owne Actions, with obſerving all the Circumſtances of them that make to his diſadvantage, to forbeare theſe fayned diſcourſes of every Action he writes of.

That in one of his anſweares to both houſes, he made profeſſion, that he was convinced that it was a plaine breach of the priviledge, it was greater ſatisfaction, then ever King gave his houſes of Parliament, and it muſt have been an inexcuſable diſloyaltie in them, to preſſe him after ſuch a profeſſion, and make it matter of complaint. Tis true his Majeſt: denyed any intention to breake their Priviledges in that Act. But no man yet could aſſigne a reaſon to exclude the King from any of his Courts, or Counſells, and why he might not aſwell come to the lower houſe as to the higher, and ſpeake to the Commons in their owne, aſwell, as ſend for them to the higher houſe, or els where, as was both law, & Cuſtome. And as no priviledge of Parliament doth extend to Treaſon, but that a Coneſtable may apprehend any member of that houſe being accuſed of that Cryme, ſo why the King ſhould be forbidden to come to the houſe to cauſe Traytours to be apprehended, none but Traytours, will finde a cauſe, but heere he ſayes he *repreſents it fraudulently*. We have found already it hath been fraudulently expreſſed by the libeller. He ſayes *the King would make ſome benificall vſe of his worſt Actions* And ſurely his Actions, which were moſt charged with guilt appeare juſt, and ſhame his accuſers.

Theſe men meaning his friends *knew not the juſt motives, and pregnant grounds with which I thought my ſelfe furniſhed.* To theſe words of his Majeſt: which he hath interlaced with *meaning his friends*, he ſayes, *his beſt friends knew not, nor ever could know, and it would have tended to his juſtifying to have named them in this place*, and to ſhew his owne impertinence the next words he cites of his Majeſt: are, that, *he had diſcovered, as he thought vnlawfull Correſpondencies, which they had vſed, and engagements to imbroyle his Kingdomes.* What more would he have had in this place? But he ſayes *ſuppoſe them reall, and knowne, what was this to that violation, and diſhonour put vpon the whole houſe, whoſe doore was forcibly kept open, & all paſſages neere it beſett with ſwords, & piſtolls cockt, & menc'd in the hands of about three hundred ſwaggerers, and Ruffians, who but expected, nay audibly called for the word of onſett to begin a ſlaughter.*

But ſuppoſe them reall, was it not a matter of more importance to appre-

apprehend ſuch conſpiratours, then to omitt the opening the doore of the houſe of Commons? Is it a diſhonour to have Traytours taken from them. There neede not any anſweare to his pretended tendernes of the houſe, that approves ſuch open violence againſt them with Pikes, and Musketts, but reproves ſwords, and Piſtolls. Doth not he thinke, that all men looke vpon him, as a common proſtitute, that vſes ſuch aggravations of a cauſe, which himſelfe defends, though accompanied with outrage, and violence. *A word of onſet to begin a ſlaughter* could never be expected by ſuch an inconſiderable number, armed only with ſwords, and piſtolls, a ſtrange preparation for a Maſſacre, but there are men apt to be diſordred by any rumours of danger, and ſome are willing to have a pretence for vnwarrantable Actions, & thence proceede theſe onſets in the ayre. He would willingly perſwade the Rebell rowte, that whatever the King may doe for the ſecuring of himſelfe, & Kingdome, Rebells may doe to deſtroy him, and vſurpe his Kingdome, and therefore to that, which his Majeſt: ſayes of the correſpondencies and engagements, which the accuſed members vſed to imbroyl his Kingdomes, the Libeller anſweares, that *he remembers not his owne conſpiracies with the Iriſh, and. French, Engliſh and ſcotch Army to come againſt the Parliament, the leaſt of which attempts by whomeſoever* he ſayes *was no leſſe, then manifeſt Treaſon againſt the Common wheallth.*

To imagine a Monarchy, and Commonwealth, or Republique in the ſame ſtate can enter into none, that vnderſtand eyther, nor that a King can commit Treaſon with his ſubjects, or againſt them. Kings have been charged with Tyrany, never with Treaſon, till thoſe brutiſh vndertakers. If there had been any law to make ſuch a Treaſon, this libeller would never have added the word manifeſt, for tis a ſure Rule with him to add moſt vehement aſſeverations, where he knowes there is no colour of truth. He well knowes how carefull the people of England were, that Treaſon ſhould not be made Arbitrary, and therefore they were confined into one poſitive law, and in that law this Author findes not his fantaſticall Treaſon. Can any, but mad men dreame, that when the priviledge of Parliament extends not to Treaſon, that they cannot committ Treaſon. Its Treaſon by the law to leavy warr againſt the King, and that this libellers Maſters have acknowledged, and can he finde it conſiſtent in the ſame Government, that there can be Treaſon in the King to leavy warr againſt the Parliament, and becauſe a King may have confederations, and Alliances with Forraigne Princes can ſubjects have ſo too? Theſe are not the opinions, but the Stratagems of Rebels. The people of England are bound to aſſiſt their King againſt any without diſtinction, and the law hath provided for their indemnitie, though the King miſcarry, but lawes are chaffe, when Rebells Raigne. The particulars he mentions, if they had been reall on his Majeſt: part, as they are only imaginary, the Actions of the Re-

bells have given Teſtimonie to their Juſtice; and neceſſitie.

To demaund Iuſtice againſt the five members, there needed not ſo rough aſſiſtance. But the ſucceſſe tells vs there needed more, for theſe members were guarded with an Army, and a fleete, and inſteed of being committed on ſuch an accuſation, which themſelves reſolved could, not be denyed by law, they protected them againſt law.

If *he had reſolved*, meaning the King, *to beare that repulſe with patience, wherefore did he provide againſt it with ſuch an armed, and vnuſuall force.* Is a Kings guard *any vnuſuall force*, and though he reſolved to beare a repulſe with patience, he could not reſolve to tempt the malice, and inſolence of thoſe, that wayted, but opportunitie to deſtroy him. But had he provided any force to ſecure himſelfe againſt inſolence, does that condradict his bearing the repulſe with patience, and heere the libeller caſts away his Argument, that he may vſe his ſcurrilitie, *that the Kings heart ſerved him not for ſuch a deſperate Scuffle.* Soe the greate hoſtilitie, and proviſions for a Maſſacre is come to noe more, then to have hazarded a deſperate Scuffle with the vnarmed houſe of Commons. The Kings heart ſerved him for the higheſt hazards, where he held his courſes juſt, and honourable, but it never ſerved him to act ſuch violences, as theſe Rebells have fayned, he intended.

There were two ſtatutes, that declared he ought firſt to have acquainted the Parliament, who were the accuſers. Theſe ſtatutes this Author, nor any man els ever read, and if there had been ſuch ſtatutes, that men ought not to be accuſed, before the Parliament be acquainted, who were the Accuſers, they were much to blame that committed ſo many for Treaſon without any Accuſers, and that theſe two ſtatutes ſhould never be practiſed, or knowne before now? How comes it, that the King, nor his Attorney generall can accuſe a man of high Treaſon, when the meaneſt ſubject of the Kingdome may doe it? Its well knowne, that the houſe of Commons vpon the word of MR. Pym, without the leaſt knowledge of the fact, or any accuſer, or witnes, charged the Earle of Strafford of high Treaſon, where were theſe lawes then? *His Majeſt ſtill profeſſing to governe by law*, as he ſayes, did no way breake it, and he was noe way oblidged to name any accuſers, eſpecially to the Parliament, where a Rebellious, and potent faction vnited themſelves to the Accuſed members, that had contrary to their owne Rules denyed that proceeding, which they declared juſt, and according to law.

The faire tryall, which was offred, was noe other, then to take opportunitie for juſtifying thoſe members, what ever the proofe were. Had it been thinkes he a prudent Act in the King to have accuſed Traytours, and made a Commiſſion to their fellowes to judge of the fact. He could not doubt of the ſame Juſtice from theſe men, which he found in many other occurrents. Could he ſuppoſe, that they would con-

condemne a Traytour, that had combined to proſecute the Treaſon, and it was not for want of juſt matter, but the foreſight of injuſtice, that cauſed his Majeſt: *to lett fall* his proceedings. When Rebells are protected by open force, when the power, and impetuoſitie of Tumults are boaſted of by this Author, when the inclination of the potent faction vnto the members is confeſſed, he would yet have the King chuſe ſuch a Tryall.

He would have it *a thirſt of revenge in the King againſt the members for oppoſition againſt his Tyranous proceedings.* If their innocence of the Treaſon had been as evident, as his Majeſt: of Tyranous proceedings, they had never been accuſed, and if they had not been conſcious of their guilt, they would never have ſought Tumultuary protection, and if his Majeſt: had thirſted for revenge, he needed not have gone to the houſe of Commons to have ſatisfied it, but Malefactours count legall pcoceedings the malice of Enemies, and effects of diſpleaſure.

To that the King (ſayes he) miſſed but litle to have produced writings vnder ſome mens hands, the libeller ſayes *he miſſed, though their chambers trunkes, and ſtudies were ſealed vp, and ſearched*, which though altogeather falſe, there might be ſuch writings, and its like there were, which cauſed the houſe of Commons to be ſoe jealous, leaſt their chambers, ſhould have been ſearched, that they made an order to vſe violence againſt any, that ſhould ſearch, a very grave vote, and a ſure ſigne of good Juſtice, if the fact had been brought before them that would prevent the diſcovery, and deny a ſearch of perſons accuſed for Treaſon.

The King ſayes *Gods providence would have it ſoe*, and to that the Libeller joynes, *that curbes the raging of proud Monarchs, aſwell, as of madd multitudes.*

Is it the curbing of proud Monarchs, when the miſſe of evidence againſt Traytours? If the King had produced this writing, he mentions, had that been a Monarchs rage? But why doth he joyne the madd multitudes, whoſe rage was then ſoe feirce, he may beleive, as he ſayes, *that God will ſet bounds vnto it*, and turne them againſt their miſleaders. Why *pregnant grounds, and probabilities*, may not both concurr in one cauſe noe man vnderſtands, though this Author would have *probabilities* a diminution after *pregnant grounds* had been vſed. His reſemblance of *Queene Maries* cuſhion, whereto he likens the Kings proofes, would have ſuted with the clout, and piſtoll, the ſtables vnder ground, the Daniſh fleete, and their many other ridiculous deviſed Conſpiracies, the bringing vp of the northerne Army, the landing of the french at Portsmouth, cutting throates by the Papiſts, and the diſignes of the ſpaniſh fleete, fitt only for the ſtory of the knight of the Son, or the wandring Jew.

As Kings goe now, what ſhadowy conceite, or groundles toy will not create a jealoſie. And was his Majeſt: jealoſie created by a toy, when thoſe perſons have acted that, which he was then jealous of. Can this breaker accuſe him of cauſeles jealoſie, when he defends the fact? And is it a ſhadowie conceite, if Kings ar jealous of ſuch Rebellious inclinations, as this Rebell vaunts of? And if theſe Rebells might have their will, there ſhould not be a King left to be jealous, and while they profeſſe their purpoſes, accuſe Kings of vnjuſt jealoſie, and if ſubjects goe now in other places, as in England, the world will have cauſe to know, that al the jealoſies of Kings were neceſſary to the preſervation of mankinde, & that there is no jealoſie of any King ſo cauſles, as the attempts of ambitious Reformers.

That his Majeſt: denies, *he hath deſign'd to aſſault the houſe of Commons*, is not contradicted by his anſweare to the Citie, *that any courſe of violence had been very juſtifiable*, The libeller gueſſes, it was not *farr from his deſigne*, becauſe *it might be ſoe*, and concludes as ſenſeleſly, that becauſe his Majeſt: forbare an act, which he held juſtifiable, *it diſcovered in him an exceſſive eagernes to be aveng'd on them, that croſſed him, and that to have his will, he ſtood not to doe things never ſoe much below him.* Soe eager is the man to rayle himſelfe out of reaſon. If he had an eagernes to be revenged, he would have done high things, and not below him. It was no *becomming ſight to ſee the King of England* ſo affronted, and abuſed by his owne ſubjects, many beholding diſobedience, and vulger inſolence with ſad hearts, and greiving at the ruine of Government, and that his Majeſt: was conſtrained to call for Juſtice, and be denyed it. Such as lament the misfortunes of Princes, cannot but abhorr the Rebellion of ſubjects, and this *vnbecoming ſight to ſee the King of England one while in the houſe of Commons, by, and by in the guild-hall among the Liveries* this libeller doth not remember out of affection to the Kings perſon, or office, but out of joy, that he was enforct to ſuch extreamitie. If he had had any ſenſe of duty, or regret at any Action ill becomming a King in reguard of his place, or dignitie, he would not ſo ſcurrilouſly deſcant on his misfortunes, with the termes of *Sollicitor, purſivant, apparitor* for that proſecution, and it is a plaine Teſtimony of the Rebellion then begun, when the King was driven to Actions beneath his Majeſt: & this libeller wil hardly allow a King more, then ſuch offices, for he ſayes the Kings office is to execute the Parliaments Commaund, and eyther in that he beleived not what he ſaid, as is moſt certen he did not, or els he vainely objects the doing of Actions beneath him, but it appeares his deſires are to reduce all Kings to the loweſt of the people.

That though the King in his anſweares to the Parliament ſaid, *that as he once concieved he had ground enough to accuſe them, ſo at length, that he found as good cauſe to deſert any proſecution of them, yet heere he ſeemes to reverſe all.*

He

He ſeemes ſoe to none, though ſome out of willfull malice would have it ſeeme ſoe. The King found, that he had good cauſe to deſert the proſecution in regard of the injuſtice, and violence of the Rebell faction; And is there any thing ſaid heere to the contrary of it? Could the King finde any cauſe to continue the proſecution vpon the cleereſt evidence, that could be produced?

It is the Method of the falſe Sectaries to inſinuate an opinion of their vertue by rigid cenſures of others, whereby they draw men from obſervation of their owne lewdenes, & they ſeeme very ſharpe againſt ſins of moſt common obloquy, & offenſive to ſobrietie, and thence the libeller calls his Majeſt: guard *the ſtaurne, and ſhipwracke of Tavernes.* Such, as were of his Majeſt: guard may not thinke to eſcape theſe falſe tongues, when their King hath taſted ſoe largely of them, and theſe hipocrites thinke to hide their blood guiltines, pride, robbery, perjury, & oppreſſion by reproaching their Enemies with *Stewes, and Tavernes.* The principall zealotts of this Rebellion were the tags, and raggs of the people, who were glad to heare voluptuous living, and riott objected to the Kings partie, that they might compare their beggery, and baſe condition before other mens vices, whether true, or fayned. If the houſe of Commons *declar'd, that the comming of thoſe Souldiers, Papiſts, and others with the King was to take away ſome of their members, and in caſe of oppoſition, or denyall to have falne vpon the houſe in a hoſtile manner,* they ſhewed themſelves men of as litle creditt, as this Author, for the world knowes, that they neither had, nor pretended proofe of ſuch a purpoſe, & their declarations in that kinde are no truer, then their profeſſions of loyaltie. If the houſe had denyed their members, and oppoſed, was it leſſe then Treaſon?

He inferrs from the Kings profeſſion, *if he purpoſed any violence, or oppreſſion againſt the innocent, then let the Enemy perſecute my ſoule, & treade my life to the ground, & lay my honour in the duſt,* that *God hath judged, and done according to the verdict of his owne mouth.* The king well knew his Enemy perſecuted his ſoule, when he wrote this, and that he was in the hands of thoſe, that would take away his life, but aſſaſſination was noe proofe of his guilt, nor of Gods judgment of his cauſe, and theſe words vſed by the prophett, and him are not an imprecation for tryall, but a deprecation of the offence, and it was not to ſatisfie men, but to acknowledge his judgment of the Cryme to God. The kings partie are aſſured, that the proceedings againſt him were odious to God, & man, and this Action touching the members was noe other, then neceſſary Juſtice, and there appeares not any purpoſe of violence, or oppreſſion of the innocent, and in vaine doe murderers ſeeke to ſhelter themſelves from the guilt of their impieties by pretending Gods ſecret Counſells, The ſinceritie of his Majeſt: heart is noe leſſe manifeſt, becauſe he fell into the hands of wicked men, who cannott treade his honour in the duſt,

duſt, which outluies their fury, and though they murthered him, his life is with the Lord, and their infamy endles. God will bring their wickednes vpon their owne heads in his due time.

The Kings admirers may ſee their madnes to miſtake this booke; But all men ſee his madnes to traduce the booke, and to prophane, and proſtitute all things ſacred to his lewde detractions, who ſayes *it is his doomesday booke not like that of William the Norman his Predeceſſour.* Thus making the common appellation of the greate day of the Lord an inducement to vilifie the kingly office, which muſt be a day of wrath to ſuch mockers, as aske, where is the promiſe of his comminge, which did theis Traytours expect, they would not proceede ſoe preſumptuouſly in their wickednes, and compile a booke of it againſt that day. The Admirers of the kings booke are noe white miſtaken, but they ſee the breaker very much miſtaken in his confidence, that thinkes all men madd, becauſe himſelfe is ſoe, and they were madd indeede, if they received his ſenſe, or ſaw not, that only rage att the excellency of the kings Booke, not right vnderſtanding made him ſeeke theſe ſilly objections, and face them with ſuch oſtentation.

Vpon the

INSOLENCIE

Of the

TUMULTS.

HE muſt confeſſe to have heere a neate, and well couch'd invective againſt Tumults, which ſurely ought not to be anſweared with a impudent defence of them. The misfortunes of Princes are the mirth of Rebells, and therefore he ſayes *Rehoboam the ſon of Solomon could not have compoſed a better.* It was not only the ſon of Solomon, but his Father David, and himſelfe too, that felt the fury, and danger of Rebells, and Rehoboams misfortune doth not mittigate the ſinfull Revolt of the ten Tribes, which the Scripture calls Rebellion, and this Author

Author ſcoffing at *his haſte to eſcape their fury* ſhewes how affectionate he is to Rebellion. That *the Tumults at whitehall were not ſoe dangerous, as theſe at ſechem* he cannot affirme, for thoſe Tumults at whitehall have produced greater impieties, and Calamities, then thoſe at ſechem, and thoſe Tumults have ſince, felt the ſcourge of their violence, as thoſe at ſechem ſoone did; their revolt being puniſht by God, who gave them a King in his rage, that brought in Idolatry with their Rebellion, which after many ſore afflictions at laſt rooted them out of their land, and they ceaſed to be a people.

He would inſinuate, that becauſe this is a neate invective, therefore the Kings *Houſhold Rhetorician* made it, but this hath as litle credit, as his exceptions have truth, or weight.

That the matter conſiderable is, whether theſe were Tumults, or noe, next, if they were, whether the King himſelfe did not cauſe them. Doubtles he would not have it beleived, that there could be any Tumults, nor any Rebellion againſt him, for if there could be any, he knowes themſelves have committed it. The knowne lawes allow noe cauſes of Tumults from provocation, for if ſoe, tumults may judge of lawes, and law makers, as theſe defended tumults preſumed to doe. His firſt cauſe is *the Kings vnwillingnes to call the Parliament*, but theis tumults were after a parliament called: *His not enduring to be overſwayed by them.* Were this a cauſe of Tumult, or Rebelliõ, ther would never be cauſe wanting of ſuch diſorders in any kingdome, or ſtate, when the Councells of kings muſt be ſubject to vulgar appeales, & Tumults muſt reforme the kings Judgment.

His often repeated impoſture *of the Kings tempting the Engliſh, or ſcotch Armyes* is groſſely introduced for a cauſe of the Tumults, when the Tumults preceded theſe ſuppoſitions, and we may ſee what cauſes this man will have of Tumults, that will make ſubſequent Actions the grounds of them.

The profering the fower northerne Counties to the ſcotts was an invention as ridiculous, as the Authors commendation of an *honeſt diſcovery* of a thing never acted. He formerly ſpake of Timpanies, and Queene Maries cuſhion, which might have cauſed him to have forborne ſuch a groſſe, and exploded a forgery.

That the Parliament, or people deſerned a malignant partie was no other, then the artifice of the conſpiratours in Parliament to deviſe names, which the people vnderſtood not, and ſuggeſt terrours to them from things, that had not entred into their thoughts, and of that nature was this name of *malignant-faction* brought foorth by the Junto to amuſe the people, but he might well remember, that not as much, as the name of *malignant partie* was hatch'd, when the Tumults begun.

The Rebellion in Ireland was then broken out, which was not till neere ſix moneths after the inſolence of the Tumults began, and that Rebellion in all probabilitie tooke example, and encouragement from theſe

The imaginary conſpiracie of Scotland while the King was there is not of a peece, the tumults having preceeded the Kings journey thither, & that conſpiracie he knowes vaniſht into ayre, & could give noe more occaſion of Tumults, then of this Authors remembrance.

That *greate numbers of vnknowne perſons reſorted to the Citie* was as vnknowne to ſuch, as were then there; as the perſons to this Author, and as ſuch reſort is knowne to be noe cauſe of ſuch Tumults.

The King being returned from Scotland diſmiſſes that guard, which the Parliament thought neceſſary in the middeſt of ſoe many dangers to have about them. Its true the conſpiratours in Parliament eyther from the guilt of their conſciences, or advantage to their plots pretended apprehenſion of danger, that they might have a guard, which they might make vſe of to execute their deſignes, and affront the members of the houſe that refuſed to cuncurr to their plotts, and therefore noe guard pleaſed them, but ſuch, as were compoſed cheifely of ſuch perſons, as made vp the Tumults.

The King diſmiſſed the guard, which the Parliament thought neceſſary, & put in another contrary to the priviledge of that high Court, and by ſuch a one commaunded as made them noe leſſe doubtfull of the guard it ſelfe. Its very likely, that they had as litle doubt of danger, from any other, as from the guard, for they ſought to create dangers to others, feared none to themſelves, but from their owne guilt. Its well knowne there was not the leaſt appearance of danger, but from what that faction intended, and ſuch deſire of a guard was noe leſſe vnknowne, then ridiculous to all former Parliaments, and it was ſoe farr from being a priviledge to that high Court, that the leaders of the faction in the lower houſe procured a vote to deſire it of the king. And how could it be contrary to the priviledge of that high Court for him to change the guards, that had firſt placed them? The guard, which the king appointed was commaunded by the cheife officer of that guard, and becauſe he gave commaund to keepe of the Tumults, therefore the Rebell faction, concluded their buſnies could not be done by ſuch a guard, nor ſuch a Commaunder. *Which* they therefore ſayes he *diſcharge, deeming it more ſafe to ſitt free, though without a guard in open danger, then encloſed with a ſuſpected ſafetie.* And in what ſafetie ſate they, that were threatned, and abuſed by thoſe Tumults every day. The viſible cauſe of a guard was the Tumults, but the cauſe, why guards were deſired was to act the ſame for which the Tumults were rayſed, and the danger pretended was a deceite, for they, that deſired a guard would rather be without one, then not have a Commaunder of their owne faction, and the houſes found noe inconvenience in the want of a guard, but in the inſolencie of the Tumults, which the ſeditious faction invited, & would not have them hindred by any guards.

The people therefore leaſt their worthyeſt, and moſt faithfull Patriotts, who had expoſed themſelves for the publique, and whome they ſaw now left naked,

ſhould

ſhould want aide, or be deſerted in the middeſt of theſe dangers, came in multitudes, though vnarm'd to wittnes their fidelitie, and readines in caſe of any violence offred to the Parliament. It hath been aldeady obſerved, that theſe Tumults preceded the deſire of guards, and they were ſoe farr from being acceptable to the Parliament, thar the houſe of Lords deſired their reſtraint, and invited the lower houſe to concurre with them to ſuppreſſe theſe Tumults, and though the factious partie withſtood the motion, yet it was thought neceſſary by a greate part of that houſe to joyne with the Lords in that deſire. And how could they wittnes their fidelitie to the Parliament, when ſoe greate a part thought them a greivance? And why did they menace, and aſſault the members of both houſes? Why did they preſcribe reſolutions to the Parliament, and in caſe their demaunds were not graunted, denounce terrour to the oppoſers? Is this fidelitie to the Parliament? This Author neede not ſeeke ſuch blinde excuſes for Tumults, that juſtifies open Treaſon, noe doubt thoſe his *faithfull Patriots* well vnderſtood, that their greateſt danger was from the law, which they had violated, and they would be ſecure by ſubverting it, and engaging, multitudes in their owne guilt. The king had reaſon *to ſend into the Citie to forbid ſuch reſorts*, and nothing, but ſedition could encourage, or permitt them.

The ſuppoſition of the kings *envying to ſee the peoples love devolved on another object*, ſhewes, that Rebellious inclinations were the deſire, and ſtrength of the leaders in the lower houſe, & the envying may be properly changed into indignation, that ſubjects ſhould breake their dutie, and become workers of their owne miſerie ſuch Tnmultuous licence had not ſoe much probabilitie *to hinder any action of the King towards the Parliament*, as to ruine the Parliament, & kingdome. The faction feared not any action of his Majeſt: but endeavoured to promote their owne deſignes againſt him.

He is now come to tells vs ſome reaſons, why the Parliament petitioned the king for a guard after they were content to ſit without one, and while be maintanies a power in his imaginary Parliament to murther the king, he preſents them petitioning the king for a guard, and their words, which he will not take notice of are worth obſerving. *The Knights Cittizens, and Burgeſſes of the houſe of Commons, your faithfull, and loyall ſubjects, who are ready to lay downe their lives, and fortunes, and ſpend the laſt dropp of their blood to maintaine your Crowne, and royall perſon in greatnes, and glory, doe caſt themſelves downe at your Royall feete*, with ſuch elaborate deceites did they hope to perſwade the king to give them a guard to oppreſſe himſelfe. Their ſubſequent actions have been a full Comment vpon theiſe wicked diſſimulations, and theis falſe profeſſions convince the preſent ſhameleſſe challenges of power in theis, that thus addreſſe themſelves.

That blood was drawne in a fray, or two at the Court gate, and even at their

owne gate in *Weſtminſter hall*. Are not theſe proper motives for a Parliament to call for guards? A Conſtable of a Pariſh might more reaſonably ſet a guard about his houſe after the parting of a fray, then the Parliament ſeeke for an armed guard vpon ſuch an occaſion. If the tumults were ſoe ſeditious, as to ſhew their inſolencie at the gate of white hall, or Weſtminſter hall, and any of them were wounded in ſuch diſorderly reſorts, it had been juſt, and neceſſary to forbid their comming in ſuch numbers, and provoking ſuch danger, and their continuance is a mainfeſt ſigne, that theſe tumults were not the voluntary motion of the people, but the inſtigation of the factious partie in Parliament.

That it was *reaſonable, and juſt for the Parliament to make choiſe of their owne guards, and Commaunder* will only appeare to ſuch, as had trayterous plotts againſt the King, and the choice, that they made of the *Earle of Eſſex* ſhewes by their after imployment, and his enſuing Actions, that the King had juſt reaſon for the refuſall, and though this Author thinke, that he hath ſaid ſomewhat by naming him *the Kings owne Chamberlaine*, yet all men ſee, that theſe obligations, which the King had put vpon that Earle, could not with hold him from being a leader to the mad multitude againſt King, and Kingdome.

It is the right of inferiour Courts to make choice of their owne guards, which is vtterly falſe, but can he tell, that ever an inferiour Court vndertooke to be guarded by a Militia, or that ever they had other guards, then from Conſtables, and inferiour officers, whome they might require to keepe the peace, and doe their dutie, and noe Court could ever make choice of any guard either for number, or Commaunder.

He ſayes, that why the King refuſed the guard deſired, *the next day made mainfeſt, for then he came to blocke vp, or aſſault the houſe of Commons*. It ſoone appeared, wherefore they deſired a guard, to protect Traytours, & deſtroy the King. That the King came to blocke vp, or aſſault, the libeller hath already confeſſed to be falſe, for he did it not, when it was in his power, & if he had refuſed a guard for that reaſon, he would have performed it, & its impertinently alleadged for the cauſe of thoſe tumults, when he hath ſhewed, that thoſe tumults were begun long before, for he lately told vs of the blood drawne at the gate of white hall, and Weſtminſter hall, which himſelfe knowes was in the tumults.

He proceedes to ſay, *that he had begun to fortifie his Court, and entertained armed men*. How abſurdly doth he produce any acts of his Majeſt: which were occaſioned by the tumults to be cauſes of the tumults? fortifying his Court, and entertaining armed men, there was good cauſe for, and what could it ſignifie, that the King fortified his owne houſe? But an apprehenſion of danger. And how could it offend any, vnles ſuch, as were diſaffected to his ſafetie?

He ſayes theſe men ſoe entertained *ſtanding at his Pallace gate reviled, and*

and with drawne ſwords wonnded many of the people, as they paſſed by in a peaceable manner, whereof ſome died. His owne relation makes it more then probable, that ſuch, as were wounded gave the occaſion of the hurt they had, for they were not drawne to the Palace gate, and might have quietly paſſed by though any of his Maj: Servants ſtood at the gate, & the truth is they dayly provoked his Maj: with inſolent, & menacinge words, & Actions, & enforced ſuch, as guarded the Court to repel them with force, & if they were reviled, they gave the provocation by their ſeditious carriage, & theſe armed men are now come to drawne ſwords there being no armes found by this Author, but ſwords, wherewith the perſons vſually walked, & which were neceſſarily drawne againſt that rowt.

The paſſing by of a multitude, though neither to St. Georges feaſt, nor to a tilting of it ſelfe was no Tumult. The expreſſion of their loyaltie, and ſtedfaſtnes to the Parliament, whoſe lives they doubted to be in danger was noe Tumult. but wherefore ſhould ſuch a multitude reſort, that had nothing to ſee, vnles they were tumults? If a multitude, of people either at St. Georges feaſt, or a tilting ſhould threaten the King, or with violence preſſe into his Court, and reproach, and aſſault ſuch, as they found there, this would be a tumult, & ſomewhat more, but this was not al theſe tumults acted, they aſſaulted the members of both houſes neere their doores, they threatned them, that conſented not to what they would have, they preſcribed to the King, and both houſes, what they ſhould doe, & doth this triviall diſcourſer make no difference betweene ſuch Actions, that are the moſt pernitious diſorders in ſtates, & the comming of a multitude to ſee a tilting. If the purpoſe of ſuch multitudes had been preſervation of the lives, or ſafeties of any members in Parliament, it was very vnſuteable to their pretence to enquire into the proceedings of the houſes, & aſſault, & menace the members. The loyaltie, which he ſayes they bare to the Parliament was il expreſt by breaking the priviledges, & wronging the members, their loyaltie was due to their King in the firſt place, & they owed nothing to the Parliament, but as their Kings Court, & Councel, but the Author thinkes fit they ſhould breake their ſworne loyaltie to their King to maintaine a faction againſt him.

If it grew to be ſo, the cauſe was in the King, & his retinue, who by hoſtile preparations, and actuall aſſailing the people gave juſt cauſe to defend themſelves. can himſelfe beleive this dreame of his, when he reades it over, that the kings preparations againſt the tumults after a long continved inſolence againſt him, ſhould more excuſe them for encreaſing their violence, then juſtifie their firſt attempts? Neede they come to white hall, or Weſtminſter to defend themſelves, but theis diſorderly, & abſurd pretences are fit Apologies for a tumultuous rowt.

Theſe petitioning people needed not have been ſo formidable to any, but to ſuch, whoſe conſciences miſgave them, how il they had deſerved of the people, and doe non forbid ſuch petitioning people but thoſe, woſe conſciences miſgave

them,how il they had deſerved of the people? why then were the kentiſh petitioners,and others ſoe roughly handled comming vnarmed, & more peaceably, then theſe Tumults? And doe the libellers Maſters permitt ſuch petitioning people at preſent, vnles it be ſome of their owne ſuborning? And are the people,which he ſoe lately deſcribed to to be exorbitant,and exceſſive in their motions become ſuch exact judges of al mens meritt,and determine of puniſhment without reſpect to their Rulers. If the libeller would have ſhewen what theſe Tumults wanted to make them Cryminall, and wherefore other Tumults were condemned, he would have found meanes to have come to himſelfe,& have ſayd, that Tumults, were neceſſary, Preparations to Rebellion.

That *the King was ſoe Emphaticall, and elaborate on this Theame will redound leſſe perhaps then he was aware to the commendation of his Government, for in good Governments they happen ſeldomeſt, and riſe not without cauſe.* It is more then perhapps, that this libellers commendation of the Tumults will condemne his defence. If Tumults never happen without cauſe,we muſt accuſe the beſt Governments of giving that cauſe,we are ſure Davids Government wanted them not, but Abſolon, and Sheba ſhall condemne the man after Gods owne heart. Did this libeller thinke any truth in ſcripture, or was he at all acquainted with it, that will have a juſt cauſe for all Tumul,s, when we reade ſoe many againſt Moyſes by the children of Iſraell? And if he had pleaſed to have peruſed the Roman ſtory, he muſt acknowledge many cauſſes Tumults in that ſtate. Its like he holds, that Demetrius, and his Craftsmen had a cauſe for their Tumults, and ſurely it was not ſoe violent,as the Tumult he defends. And if all Tumults, and Rebellions be cauſed by ill Government,we may reaſonably conclude,that the people needed not Governours, that knew ſoe well how to governe themſelves, and did never judge a miſſe of the Actions, or Councells of their Governours. The libeller at firſt ſaid he tooke vp the gantlet for libertie, and the Commonwealth, which he hath now expounded to be for deſtruction of libertie, and Kingdome by Tumults.

If they prove extreame,& pernicious (that is the Tumults) *they were never counted ſo to Monarchy, but to Monarchical Tyrany.* Who doubts,but Rebels wil pretend Tyrany, & oppreſſion. Did ever reaſonable man befor this vnreaſonable creature pretend,that Tumults were not pernicious to all governments,& can any mã conceive,that they wil not grow extream, if not prevented,but left to their owne violence? what is become now of his judgment of the peoples exceſſive, and extravagant motions, are there none in Tumults? Can any Rebellion want a pretence,if the extreamitie of it be a proofe of Tyrany in the Rulers? There can hardly be ſuppoſed an aſſertion more vovde of truth,& modeſtie. What publique wickednes was there ever acted to the ſubverſion of Kingdomes, but by Tumults? How many vſurpations, how many murthers of

moſt

moſt vertuous Princes have been acted by Tumults? But this libeller glories in thoſe exploites of the rabble, and makes the Calamities they have brought on others the matter of his mirth.

Extreames he ſayes *are at moſt Antipathy. If then the King ſoe extreamely ſtood in feare of Tumults, the inference will endanger him to be the ollierr extreame.* Where doth he finde in his learning, that Tumults, and Tyrany are at any Antipathy, which are but one, and the ſame thing, for was there ever greater Tyrany exerciſed, then by Tumults? And are not the lawes of all ſtates moſt ſevere againſt Tumults? And can there be any inference from thence, that the Government is Tyrany, are not Government, and Tumults at moſt Antipathy? Its a certen Rule, that all watchfull Governours wil feare Tumults. The King had juſt cauſe to feare the Calamities enſuing the violence of Tumults, and this trifler vainely infers his fancied extreames from a prudent foreſight, and if there were noe other example of cauſeles, and miſcheivous Tumults then thoſe the King complained of, they only were ſufficient to inſtruct the world vpon what miſtaken rumours they are rayſed, and vnto what deſperate impieties they proceede.

He never thought any thing more to preſage the miſcheifes, that enſued, then thoſe Tumults. To this ſayes the libeller. *Thoſe Tumults were but the milde effects of an evill, and injurious Raigne.* Tumults the prodigious, and peſtilentiall raignes get vp in a milde, and gracious Government, wherein ſeditious, and trayterous factioniſts take libertie to defuſe their venom among the people, and milde tumults, and loyall Rebellion are phraſes agreable to this mans modeſtie.

Thoſe ſignes were to be read more apparent in his rage, and purpoſed revenge of thoſe clamours of the people. That thoſe tumults might overcome the patience of any King, the ſeveritie vſed vpon leſſe provocations by others is a full evidence, but his Majeſt: moderation was conſtant, rage, and revenge being only legible in his Enemies. That tumults did preſage the miſcheifes enſuinge, al knowing men concurr with his Majeſt: and deſcerne the libellers ſervile defence of popular clamours.

Not any thing portends more Gods diſpleaſure againſt a nation, then when he ſuffers the clamours of the vulgar to paſſe all bounds of law, and reverence to Authoritie, to this he ſayes, *it portends rather his diſpleaſure againſt a Tyranous King.* As God ſometimes gives an evil King to a people, ſoe whenever he deſtroyes that King by the *contemptible vulgar*, it is a ſigne of the encreaſe of his diſpleaſure, and ſeldome, or never was any King good, or evill ſoe deſtroyed, but the peoples ſufferings were encreaſed.

That thoſe, whome he calls *a ſupplicating people, and that did noe hurt to law, or authoritie, but ſtood for it in the Parliament* were a Rebell rabble cannot be doubted, ſince the libeller defends them, and he cannot be beleived they did noe hurt to law in as much, as he defends the ſubverſion of law, and the attempts of this *ſupplicating people*, that were in order

order to that end. This ſupplicating is one of his aboliſht Ceremonies, The libeller tells, that they ought to have ſtood for law, the world knownes they did the contrary, and he is wittnes both of their guilt, and his owne falſhood.

That they invaded the honour, and freedome of the two houſes. To this he ſayes, *It is his officious accuſation, not ſeconded by the Parliament, who, had they ſeene cauſe, were beſt able to complaine.* And how were they able, when they were threatned, if they did complaine, and becauſe the Parliament is overawed by Tumults, that they cannot complaine, therefore their fredome is not invaded. But how ſhameleſly he charges the King with the officious accuſation, he tells vs in the next words, for he ſayes, *if they ſtrucke, or menaced any,* as the King ſaid, *they were ſuch, as had more relation to the Court, then to the Common wealth, Enemies, not Patrons of the people.* Is not the honour, and freedome of the two houſce invaded, when their members ar ſtrucke, and menaced? And is it an officious accuſation to ſay ſoe? Can this man pretend the name of Parliament, when he will allow the baſe rabble to abuſe them at pleaſure? And could any man but he tell the King, that *perſons elected were not ſent to be Cavelled at by him, or entertained with an vndervalue of their temper, judgment, or affection,* and heere defend the raſcallitie in ſtriking, and menacing the members, and not only vndervaluing their temper, judgment, and affection, but handling them, as cullions. Never was libeller more paſſionately malicious, more blindly abſurd, more wilfully falſe, yet he thinkes he hath a reſerve againſt all oppoſition, for he ſayes, *if their petitioning vnarmed were an invaſion of both houſes, what was his beſetting it with armed men.* Is ſtriking, and menacing ſoe quickly returned to petitioning, Is it a way of anſweare not to ſpeake to the queſtion? Did ever Kings of England come without an armed guard to the Parliament, and doe they beſet the houſe, when the guard is at the doore? And can he ſay, that the Kings comming with his guard to the houſe is a greater invaſion of the honour, & freedome of the houſes, then the ſtriking, and menacing the members by the Tumults? Doubtles he had conſulted better to his credit to have ſaid nothing, then that, which was ſoe different from the caſe himſelfe had ſtated, and his repetition of petitioning, and ſupplicating people is noe other, then the noyſe of the Epheſian Rabble, that greate is Diana of the Epheſians.

The King ſayes, *They forbore not rude deportments, contemptuous words, and Actions to himſelfe, and his Court.* And to this the libeller ſayes. *It was noe wonder, having heard what treacherous hoſtilitie he had deſigned againſt the Citie, and his whole Kingdome, that they forbore to handle him, as people in their rage have handled Tyrants heere to fore for leſſe offences.* The ſupplicating, and petitioning people may vſe rude deportments, contemptuous words, and actions. To what purpoſe hath he minced his Tumults into ſupplicating, & petitioning people, when he defends their higheſt violence?

lence? *The King deſign'd Treacherous hoſtilitie againſt the Cittie, and Kingdome.* The laſt thoughts, that madd men had before their deſtraction run moſt in their fancie in the time of their frenſie, and theſe Traytours having loſt all reaſon inculcate ſtill thoſe ridiculous fraudes wherewith at firſt they ſeduced the people. The deſignes of Treacherous hoſtilitie was one of the Ceremonies, which its now time to give over. Who but an Idiot can beleive, that the King can have Treacherous deſignes againſt his Kingdome, whereof ſhal he be King, & whome ſhall he have to execate hoſtilitie againſt his owne Kingdome? but theſe dreames of the blowing vp of Thames, and tales of winde mills, and fiery Dragons are over, and its become the peoples ſorrow, and ſhame to looke backe vpon the cheates, whereby they were deluded. He cannot name any Tyrant ill handled by tumults vpon ſuch pretences, as he makes, & the moſt wicked Tyrant was not ſoe guiltie, as that people, which exerciſed their rage vpon him, yet the libeller determines, that the tumults fury is as juſtifiable, as the Parliaments order, for he aſcribes noe more to the one, then the other.

They were not a ſhort ague, but a feiree quotidian feaver. And the libeller ſayes *he may beſt ſay it who moſt felt it.* He will rather boaſt of the greatenes of their villany, then reprove the impietie of it, and therefore he ſports himſelfe with the injuries of it, after his appellations of mildnes, and ſupplicating people, and extolls the higheſt of their violence, as a feirce quotidian feaver, and he is ſoe Lunatique, that out of his malice to the King, he calls them milde, & out of his inſolence confeſſes them violent, and deadly.

The King would perſwade vs, that men ſcared themſelves, & others without cauſe. And al men are now ſatisfied of the truth of it, the fraudes being ſoe apparent, and confeſſed by this breaker.

Wiſe feare, and ſuſpition would finde weapons. And we have found by experience, that Rebells by ſuggeſting vaine feares, and ſuſpitions have gotten weapons, and armed the people to their owne deſtruction.

Vpon the Kings repeating the miſcheifes done by the tumults, that *they firſt petitioned, then protected, dictate next, and laſtly overaw the Parliament. They removed obſtructions, they purged the houſes, caſt out rotten members.* He ſayes, *if there were a man of Iron ſuch as Talus by our poet ſpencer, is fain'd to be the Page of Iuſtice, who with his Iron flaile could doe all this, and expeditiouſly without thoſe deceitefull formes, and Circumſtances of law worſe, then Ceremonies in Religion, I ſay God ſend it done, whether by one Talus, or by a thouſand.* Religion, & lawes are leſſe then Ceremonies in this Authors account, and when Pages follow not, nor acknowledge, Maſters Juſtice wilbe ill waited on, ſuch cut-throates are not the Pages of Juſtice, but the furies of hell, and theis this libeller prayes to God for; what will not ſuch call Juſtice to ſatisfie their ambition, and crueltie? Poets are ſhort in their fancies of what the Engliſh Rebells have acted. Their

Gyants were Pigmyes to theife Monſters, and their Hidra too few heads,& too litle venom for the ſervice of theſe Enemies of mankinde. What a ſilly propertie does this libeller make Parliament, and lawes, that ſubjects them to Tumults, and how barbarous are their proceedings, that made endeavour to ſubvert fundamentall lawes a Capitall Cryme, and heere he commends the fact,& calls them deceitefull formes, and Circumſtances of law. Might he not better have ſaid, they would make good their villanies by the ſword, then prevaricate, and ſay, and vnſay, and pretend Religion, and yet pray God to ſend Tumults, and Confuſions to breake all lawes in order to their deſignes?

The King ſayes, *they ſubdued the men of conſcience in Parliament, backed, and abetted all ſeditious, & ſchiſmaticall propoſalls againſt Government Eccleſiaſticall, and Civill.* To this he ſayes. *That it was not the Kings grace, but this Iron flaile, the people, that drove the Biſhopps out of their Baronies, Cathedralls, Lords houſe, Coopes, ſurpliſſes, papiſticall innovations, threw downe high Commiſſion, ſtarr chamber, gave vs a trienniall Parliament, and what we moſt deſired.* And is not this brave? Is it a credit to a Church to be thus reformed? Is this the Chriſtian Religion to glory in oppreſſion, robery, and Rebellion? There is noe doubt, but many things graunted by his Majeſt: in the late Parliament, were Acts of grace in reſpect of his compliance with importunitie, in hope thereby to preſerve the people from a Civill warr, not in reſpect of the nature of the things graunted. The libeller might have remembred, that the King never conſented to drive the Biſhopps out of their Baronies, or Cathedralls, and his Trienniall Parliament, which he ſoe much commends is repealed by his new Maſters, for the people muſt not looke for the execution of any ſuch law. And this Iron flaile, the raſhnes, and crueltie of a diſordered multitude hath threſht, and broken the bones, & ſinewes of the people, and made them know the difference betweene a golden Scepter, and an Iron flaile.

In revenge whereof *he ſayes he now ſoe bitterly inveighs againſt them.* And how can the libeller thinke it bitter, when their Actions, which he confeſſes exceede in impietie the greateſt Crymes, that ever were inveighed againſt? And if we could wonder at any thing, we might wonder at his mention of *Schiſmaticall propoſalls conſented to by the King*, when he wel knowes, noe one thing by him mentioned of Cathedralls, or Ceremonies was conſented to by the King, & noe leſſe ſtrange is it, that the other particulars are by him recited, as intended by the King *to be the Seditious propoſalls*, though all of them are not free from that name, when as there were ſoe many ſeditious, and Trayterous propoſalls beſides theſe.

That *theſe Tumults played the haſtie midwives, and would not ſtay the ripening, but went ſtreight to ripping vp, and forcibly cut out abortive votes, to this be* oppoſes, *that the Parliament complained not, and therefore thoſe confluxes*

were

were not by them thought Tumultuous. And were they not thought Tumultuous by ſuch, as they had expelled, and driven away from the Parliament? And did he but in his laſt words call them an Iron flaile, and recount the wonders, which they wrought, and now would not allow them to be Tumults? We may beſure the ſeditious faction in Parliament ſtirred them vp, and ſuch, as differed in judgment, or affection from them, were enforced eyther to be abſent, or ſilent,

But what good man had not rather want, any thing the moſt deſired for the publique good, then attaine it by ſuch vnlawfull, and irreligious meanes, which is ſayes the libeller *had not rather ſit ſtill, and let his Contrey be Tyranized, then like men demaund their rights, and liberties,* And that is the people ought, when they thinke fit to Rebell againſt their Governours, and ſay their lawes are deceitefull, and their Government Tyranicall.

This is the artificialleſt peice of finenes to perſwade men to be ſlaves, that the Court could have invented. Is it not Scripture, *that we may not doe evill, that good may come of it,* And what other thing doth the King ſay, or this libeller make the artificialeſt finenes of the Court, Traytours perſwade men, that they demaund their right, while they ſeeke only to oppreſſe the right of all men by a lawles vſurpation, and noe man can doubt, but ſuch, as Rebell will make pretences, and not ſpare the lawes of God by prophane interpretations, nor the Actions of their Rulers by falſe repreſentations.

The morall of this leſſon would better ſerve the teacher, and it is the libellers ſenſe. *What good man had not rather want a boundles, and arbitrary power, and thoſe fine flowers of the Crowne called Prerogatives, then for them to vſe force, and perpetuall vexation to his faithfull ſubjects, nay to wade for them through blood, and Civill warr.* And have not theſe Rebells waded through blood, and Civill warr to place theiſe Prerogatives, & flowers of the Crowne vpon themſelves, and continue force, and perpetuall vexation vpon the people of England to ſet vp a boundles, & arbitrary power. The Kings juſt Prerogatives, and flowers of his Crowne were of abſolute neceſſitie for his peoples ſafetie, & they could be a vexation to noe faithfull ſubjects This libeller hath inherited Cains lurce, a reſtles motion, and diſcord within himſelfe, that heere talkes of faithfull ſubjects, and by, and by will allow none to be ſubjects, nor faithfull, but the King is their officer, and noe oaths binde them to him.

The King ſayes, *who were the cheife Demagogues to ſend for thoſe Tumults, ſome alive are not ignorant,* he ſayes *the King cannot coine Engliſh as he could money, & tis beleived this wording was above his knowne ſtile, and ortography, and accuſes the whole compoſure to be conſcious of ſome other author.* And this learned obſervation vpon the word Demagogue deſerves the Laurell. Why is demagogue amore *hob goblin* word, then Pedagogue? And why ſhould the one be above the kings *knowne ſtile, & ortography* more then the other? And why may not the king make an Engliſh word current,

as well as another, There are very many whoſe knowyne ſtile, and ortography is beneath the Kings, that could have tranſcribed Demagogue out of many Engliſh Authors without offending againſt ortography.

If theſe Demagogues were men of reputation with the rabble, it adds not to their reputation with knowing men, nor leſſens the guilt, nor danger of thoſe tumults, but rather made them more miſcheivous; & the baſer ſort of people have ſuch moſt in reputation, as are neereſt to their owne condition being ſtrangers to vertue, and true worth.

The King ſayes *complaints were made, yet noe redreſſe could be obtained.* To this he returnes the Parliaments complaint of danger, and that it *cheered them to ſee ſome ſhore of their friends, and in the Roman, not pettifogging ſenſe, their Clients ſoe neere about them.* Though he ſometimes vſe the names of Juſtice, and Patriotts, and love of Countrey, yet he affects nothing more, nor prayſes any thing ſoe much, as ſeditious contrivances, and exploits, and to defend the Tumults, while he would deny there were any, and the ſeditious Gracchy, Catilnie, and other conſpiratours againſt the Roman Senate ſ halbe commended, for what were theſe Clients in the Roman ſenſe, but a powerfull number of ſuch perſons, as were readie to fire the ſtate at the commaund of their Patron. The Senate never made vſe of ſuch Clients, but the power of private men by them became the ruine of that ſtate, and he hath given himſelfe a full anſweare, why the Parliament complained not of the Tumults, when he boaſts, that they were cheered to ſee them.

The Parliament, and people demaunded Iuſtice for thoſe aſſaults, if not murthers, meaning thoſe pretended brawles at the Court gate. If any had demaunded Juſtice they might have had it, for what ſ hould hinder? the procedings of noe Court were ſ hutt but by the Rebells. And it is not Poeticall fury, but Bedlam diſtraction to compare the hurts done in a fray, ptrovoked by an vnruly rabble to *the ſheddinge of the blood of Nabaoth*, and the murther of the king to the revenge of Nabaoths blood. Their choiſe of the place for that execrable Act before the kings Pallace gate is only an evidence of the pride, and malice of their hearts, and of their ſelfe condemning conſciences, that contrived Circumſtances to diſguiſe their crueltie with a counterfaite of Juſtice.

The king complaines, that *he found noe declarations of the Biſhopps could take place againſt the Tumults.* To this he askes, *was that worth his conſidering, that fooliſh, and ſelfe vndoing declaration of twelue Cypher Biſhopps, who were immediately appeacht of Treaſon for that audacious declaring?* Surely it was worth the conſidering in reguard of the Juſtice of the declaration, and the Injuſtice towards thoſe Biſhopps, and there can hardly be produced a more impudent Act by an aſſembly of men, that would allow tumults to offer violence to their members, and charge their members for complaining of the injury with Treaſon.

And

And as they proceeded without ſhame, or truth, ſoe they make it their mirth, that they could by ſuch a ridiculous meanes, effect ſoe greate a villanie. That declaration, which he calls fooliſh, and ſelf vndoing will ſtand a perpetuall Monument of the vertue, and courage of theſe Biſhopps, and the infamy of thoſe Cipher Lords, that committed them. And if the Biſhopps *were pulled by their Rochetts*, as he admitts, was not this a juſt cauſe in feare in his Majeſt? And doth this *pulling by the Rochetts* amount to nothing but petitioning? This libeller ſayes, the *Biſhopps deſerved another kinde of pulling*. And noe doubt he would have juſtified their murther in the ſtreetes, aswell, as the Kings ſince, and that muſt not have been the blood of Nabaoth. He would inferr, that the King *had noe cauſe of feare, becauſe he came the next day after his going to the houſe of Commons into the Citie without a guard*. The King beleived at that time the Citie was not ſoe totally debaucht, but that he might finde ſome, that would guard him againſt the diſloyaltie of others, and thoſe humble demeanours, which he mentions are well knowne to be moſt inſolent provocations of baſe people, and though at that time the infection was not ſoe venemous, as it grew afterwards, yet the king found diſloyaltie very apparent.

Though the King might have feared in reguard of his owne guiltines, yet he knew the people ſoe full of awe, and reverence to his perſon, as he dared to committ himſelfe ſingle among them. If the King had knowne guiltines in himſelfe, he could not have hoped for that awe, and reverence, but his going ſingle at ſuch a time, and after ſoe many affronts ſhewes the audacious ſcurrilitie of this Author, that hath taunted at him ſoe often for ſeares, and terrours, and now ſayes he dared goe ſingle among ſuch outragious tumults. And if awe, and reverence to his perſon were a commendation to the people, as this libeller would have it, it muſt be the brand of infamy vpon him, and his Rebellious packe, that have troden awe, and reverence vnderfoote, and wickedly deſpiſed, and murthered him.

He would prove, that the King had no feares after all the reproachfull ſcoffing at his feares, *becauſe he went into Scotland after the Biſhopps had been worſe handled, then in England, and after two Armies had entred England againſt him, and this he ſayes argues firſt, that he was a ſtranger to England, and full of diffidence. To the Scotts only a native King in his confidence, though not in his dealing*, next he ſayes, *which ſhewes beyound doubting, that all his feare of Tumults was but a pretence.* Wee cannot boubt, that this Authors braine is as Giddy, as the Tumults, for to prove, that the King had noe feare of the Tumults, he affirmes him diffident to the Engliſh confident of the Scotts, and labours much to make periods of non ſenſe, that he may vſe words of Calumnie. Might not the King have cauſe to feare in reguard of their malice, though

not his perſonall ſuffering? And doth not his libeller ſhew his vaine falſhood, that heere makes the king feareles, and ſoe lately made mirth of the terrours of the Tumults. The libeller doubted he ſhould not finde credit to his many contradictions touching the tumults, & therefore turnes about to another theame of the Kings relation to the ſcotts, and is ſo voyde of ſenſe, as having affirmed within ten lines before, that the king was confident of the awe, and reverence of the people of England to his perſon, heere ſayes he was full of diffidence.

But he ſayes *he tooke occaſion from the Tumults of abſence from the Parliament, to turne his diſorderly bickerings to an orderly invadinge.* That the King might be abſent without ſhewing a reaſon why, from his Parliament, noe man of knowledge, or common reaſon ever doubted, and he might, as well goe to Yorke, as into Scotland. But he muſt be perſecuted by diſorderly Tumults, if he ſtay, and followed with a formed Army, if he depart, and they, that ſought Colours, and diſguiſes for the Tumults grow ſoe impudent to rayſe an Army for the King to fight againſt him.

The King ſayes *he would not have weakened himſelfe by ſoe many former, and after Acts, if he had meditated warr, as ſome ſuſpected, when he left white hall.* The libeller ſayes *his former Acts did not weaken him, & it might come into his minde after paſſing theſe Acts.* That which ſtrengthened the Rebells muſt weaken him, and was the Act for continuance of the Parliament, without which they could not have ſate, nor acted, nor deluded the people, nor part of their ſtrength, nor the Kings weakenes? But he that objects cunning fetches, and evill Councellours to the king now allowes him nothing, but improvidence, and feare.

The King *doubted not, but all had gone well, if the Parliament had ſate ſtill free, as it was in its firſt election*, and ſayes the libeller, *his not doubting was all good mens greateſt doubt.* And theis are the good men, that could not endure a free Parliament, and the libellers Parliament, that muſt governe is a new modell, not a free Parliament, as it was at firſt elected; that ſtood not with their Rebellious diſignes, and his good men doubted, that all would not ſoe well with them, if that ſate ſtill free, & therefore the Iron flaile muſt thruſt the Biſhopps out of the Lords houſe, and purge the lower houſe, and yet it is ſtill Tyrany, and obſtinacie in the King by this mans judgment not to accept all the Dictates of this ridiculous packe, and he hath a narrow conſcience, and not fitt for the publique, that follows not the cry of this kennell.

To the Kings reſolution to *heare reaſon, and conſent, as farr, as he could comprehend.* The libeller askes, *what if his reaſon comprehend nothing, but his owne advantages, was this a reaſon to be truſted with the common good of three nations?* Yes truly, and it is noe Paradox, that if the King comprehend his owne advantages, it is ſufficient for the common good of the three nations, for whatever is their common good is his advantage, and

what-

whatever is his advantage is their Common good, but all his Patriotts for whome the libeller is ſoe Zealous have advantages of their owne, that are oppoſite to the Common good of the three nations.

The King ſayes, *as ſwine are to gardens, ſoe are Tumults to Parliaments* To this ſayes the libeller. *The Parliament could beſt have told vs, had they found it ſo.* And doubtles ſuch of the Parliament, as found it not, may be accounted among the number of theſe ſwine, or the herdsmē of them.

But he ſayes *one greate hogge may doe as much miſcheife in a garden, as many litle ſwine.* And it ſeemes, that the like evill ſpirit, as entred into the heard of ſwine hath poſſeſt this libeller, and driven him on head long in his Rebellious impudence.

The King ſayes, *he was ſome times prone to thinke, that had he called this laſt Parliament to any other place in England, the ſad conſequences might have been prevented.* To ſhew, that the place could have made noe change, the libeller inſtances in his Majeſt: firſt Parliament at oxford, which was diſſolved. What doth that prove to contradict what his Majeſt: ſayes, that if he had called the Parliament at another place, theſe ſad conſequences might have been prevented? Does the libeller thinke, that becauſe there was miſvnderſtanding betweene the King, and ſome of his Parliaments, that they would therefore have run to the ſame extreamities, that the faction in this laſt did, or that theſe factioniſts could have brought this miſcheife vpon the kingdome, by like Tumults in another place.

He goes on to ſay, *that the King called his laſt Parliament at Oxford a Mungrell Parliament conſiſting all of his friends.* Noe doubt there were in that Parliament many loyally affected to his Majeſt: but it cannot be denyed, for time hath tryed it, that there were many among them, that were ſpyes, and diſturbers corrupted by the Rebell faction at Weſtminſter, and their owne baſe inclinations, who ſought to diſorder all Councells, and conſultations.

The libeller would comprehend the whole people of England within the Tumults, & interprett the Kings prayer againſt the tumults to be a prayer againſt his people. Is it not God, that ſtilleth the raging of the ſea, & madnes of the people? And is not a prayer for the people to pray they may be delivered from ſuch madnes, and yet this libeller ſayes, that the king praying to be delivered from the Tumults prayeth to be delivered from the people, and blaſphemouſly concludes, God ſave the people from ſuch interceſſours. And we cannot beleive, that God is in his thoughts, whoſe mouth ſoe often abuſeth his name.

ΕΙΚΩΝ ΑΚΛΑΣΤΟΣ

Vpon the Bill for

TRIENNIALL PARLIAMENTS,

and for ſetling this, &c.

HE ſayes *the Bill for Trienniall Parliaments was a good Bill, and the other for ſetling this at that time very expedient.* And this he ſayes in the kings owne words *was noe more then what the world was fully confirmed he might in Iuſtice, reaſon, honour, and conſcience graunt them, for to that end he affirmes to have done it.* This man hath a confirmed enmitie againſt truth, & cannot make a right recitall. The kings words are, *that the world might be fully confirmed, in my purpoſes at firſt to contribute what in Iuſtice, reaſon, honour, and conſcience I could to the happy ſucces of this Parliament, I willingly paſt the Bill for Trienniall Parliaments.* The greatenes of the truſt, which his Majeſt: put vpon the people by paſſing that Bill was a ſtrong Argument, that he would deny nothing, which in Juſtice, reaſon, honour, and conſcience he might graunt, not that the world was confirmed he might graunt that Bill in reaſon, honour, and conſcience in reſpect of the matter of it, for a greate part of the world was of opinion, he might with better reaſon have denyed it, had not his deſire to ſhew his purpoſes of contributing what he could to the happy ſucceſſe of the Parliament moved him. And they might be confirmed thereby of his purpoſes to deny nothing, which in Juſtice, reaſon, honour, and conſcience he could contribute to the happy ſucceſſe of the Parliament.

It is the Kings manner to make vertues of his neceſſities, and that neither prayſe, nor thankes are due to him for theſe beneficiall Acts. It cannot be expected, that Rebells will retaine gratitude, that have caſt of loyaltie, but let vs looke on his reaſons, and the firſt is, *that this firſt Bill graunts much leſſe, then two former ſtatutes yet in force by Edw. the 3. that a Parliament ſhould be called every yeare, or oftner, if neede were.* Either the libeller is vaine in producing this inſtance, or in commending the Bill, that gave much leſſe, then two former lawes in force, and he muſt make the

Par-

Parliament very inconſiderate, that would ſoe much importune a law ſoe fair ſhort, of what former lawes had enacted. His *ancient law booke called the mirror, and his late Treatiſe, that Parliaments by our old lawes were to be twice a yeare at London, carry as litle Authoritie*, as cleerenes, what thoſe Parliaments were they mention, but neither the ſtatutes, nor law bookes did ever affirme the right of calling Parliaments in any other then the King, or that he might not deferr the calling of them, if he ſaw cauſe, and theſe ſtatutes were made to declare the ſubjects dutie to attend the King in his Parliament once a yeare, or oftner, if neede were, and there was noe reaſon why oftner ſhould have been inſerted into the law, if any obligation were intended thereby vpon the King. And its contrary vnto the writt, whereby Parliaments are called, that the time of Parliaments ſhould be defined, for it is recited to be an Act of Councell to call a Parliament, which needed not, if it were neceſſary at a prefixed time.

The ſecond Bill he ſayes *was ſoe neceſſary, that nothing in the power of man more ſeemed to be the ſtay of all things from ruine, then that Act.* We are ſure, that nothing did more confirme the deſignes of the Traytours nor haſten that ruine of the Kingdome they have wrought, then that Act. All men deſcerne the fraudulent artifices vſed to gaine that Bill by pretending publique debts, which ſeditious faction had contracted, and intended to encreaſe for the carrying on of their Rebellion, and his Majeſt: in graunting that Bill hoped to take of thoſe occaſions of it: the Reports, which they caſt out among the people of his vnwillingnes to rayſe money for diſcharge of the Armyes. *Theſe charges were occaſioned by the Kings ill ſtewardſhipp*, but the world is ſatisfied, it was from a trayterous conſpiracie of the guides of this Rebellion. He alleadges *his needeles rayſing of two Armies to withſtand the Scotts*, which noe man, but a profeſt Rebell can ſoe call, for ſhould he have rayſed noe Army, but left all to the mercy of the invader? next he *had beggerd both himſelfe, & the publique.* When by this libellers owne confeſſion the King had received noe ſupplies from the publique for rayſing thoſe Armies, and theſe ſhameles Traytours bluſh not to talke of the Kings beggering of the people, when the greate plentie his Government had enriched them with, is ſoe viſible in thoſe vaſt leavies, which the Rebells have ſince made vpon them.

The King left vs vpon the ſcore of his needy Enemies. If they had not been too much friends to the traytours of England, there had been noe ſcore to them, for all men know whatever they received from England was by the contrivance of the Trayterous faction in Parliament to accompliſh their ends. *To diſengage him greate ſumms were borrowed.* Which its well knowne was not to diſengage the King, but to advance the deſignes of the Traytours, who dealt vnder hand with ſome of the Scotts to protract the Treatie, that the charges might be encreaſt.

The errours of his Government had brought the Kingdomes to ſuch, extreames, as were incapable of recovery without the abſolute continuance of this Parliament. They never did one act after that Bill, but in order to the Kingdomes confuſion, and all men ſaw there were noe extreames to be recovered at the time of paſſing that Bill, but the returne of the Scotts, and the diſbanding the faction in Parliament, and the only recovery had been by ſetting an end to the Parliament, which they, that made it their propertie could not endure.

The King paſt theſe Acts unwillingly. It cannot be doubted, but the King foreſaw the danger of both, and the libeller might have ſeene in the firſt ſection of this Chapter, that his Maj: was not without doubt, *that what he intended for a remedy might prove a diſeaſe beyound all remedy*, and though to avoyde a Civill warr he made ſome conceſſions in hope to bring the people to ſee their owne good, which might turne to his, and their greater miſcheife, if by them ill applyed, yet his Majeſt: deſerves prayſe, and thankes for ſuch Acts of grace, and the neceſſitie, which this libeller ſoe impudently vrges to take of his Majeſt: juſt thankes. was the danger of a Civill warr, which his Majeſt: ſought by theſe Acts to prevent, and might have entred into with leſſe hazard before the paſſing of theſe Bills, then after. The libeller only encreaſes the infamy of the Rebells ingratitude, and his owne impudence by obtruding neceſſities to take of the Kings grace in paſſing thoſe Bills, and it had not the ſhape of *a Maſterly brow*, but gracious aſpect in his Majeſt: ſaying the greatnes of the obligation above their deſerts, that he had put vpon them by paſſing the firſt Bill, and the Maſterly brow ſuites not with the following ſcurrilous conceite, that the kings recital of the obligation he had putt vpon them by that Act was, *as if he had beggd an office to a ſort of his deſertles groomes*, and theſe deſertles groomes now Rule the new Republique, there being none, that had the leaſt deſert that would accept ſuch a Trayterous office.

That the King paſſed the latter Bill to prevent the encreaſe of the preſent diſorders, not out of conſideration of the fittnes of that Bill, he neede not ſpend time to prove, and his conſent was moved from the reaſon of the time, not the matter, and the libeller hath well obſerved, *that they had offended him much more after the paſſing of the former Bill*, which is not to their creditt, but ſhame.

It was feare made him paſſe the Bill, leaſt the Parliament, and people incenſed by his conſpiracies ſhould reſent his doings, if he had added the denyall of this only meanes to ſecure themſelves. Either his memory is ſhort, or his abſurditie vnnaturall that ſoe lately ſaid the kings feares were pretences, and does he thinke, that his Majeſt: could feare their reſenting more at that time, then afterward, beſides his ſuppoſed fantaſticall conſpiracies were not as much, as named, or ſpoken of to Parliament, or people at the time of paſſing that Bill, and there cannot be imagined

any

any cause of his Majest: passing that Bill, but his earnest desire to avoyde a Civil warr, and assure his people of his purpose by committing so greate a trust vnto them, neither can there be imagined other cause, why the passing of that Bill was soe much importun'd by the Rebells, but to secure themselves, for being conscious of their owne guilt they knew themselves vnsecure, vnles they gained a power over King, and lawes. The libeller cannot excuse neither the ingratitude, nor disloyaltie of the Rebel partie in Parliament, from the Kings consent to these lawes to prevent disorders, and mischeifes, which in themselves had not been fitt, for his consent at another time, and their insolence *in binding him first of all his Predecessours*, shewes their corruption, and guilt, that would vse soe much violence, & disloyaltie to a Prince whose, gratious Government had least of all his Predecessours provoked it.

The King taxes them *with vndoing what they found well done*. The libeller sayes: *They vndid nothing in the Church, but Lord Bishopps, Liturgies Ceremonies, high Commission judged worthy by all true Protestants to be throwne out of the Church.* These Protestants, which are true only to him will judge the like of all Kings, and Rulers of State, and all orders of the Church, that are not of their Bedlem patterne. These false Sectaries talke of Church, & true Protestants just as they doe of Parliament, as long, as it consists of their owne limbs, it must be obeyed, but if it dissent from their Commaunds, then they are worse, then Ceremonies in Religion. Doubtles al true Protestants abhorre this den of Schismatickes, that boast of their Rebellious defacing of the Church, and hate their societie, there having not been yet any true Protestant, Church, that ever pretended, that Lord Bishopps, Leiturgies, Ceremonies, or high Commission were worthy to be throwne out of the Church the greatest part of Protestants retaining the like.

They vndid nothing in the state, but irregular, and grinding Courts. The Courts they tooke away were judged by al wisemen to have been profitable to the Kingdome, and fitt to be continued, and the best Governours sometimes graunt that to the peoples irregularities thereby to preserve them from proceeding to their owne ruine, which were fitt to deny at another time, & its their Zeale to publique safetie, not feare, and dissimulation, as the libeller calls it.

It was a greater confidence of the people to put into one mans hand a power to Summon, and dissolve Parliaments, then the King put in the people by the Act of continuance of the Parliament. And if the libeller could shew the Act, whereby the people put that power in the King, he had said some thing. But how had they put it into his hands, or what confidence was it, if they might take it away, when they list? This man cannot see truth through his owne contradictions, & while he acknowledges the Kingly power to Summon, and dissolve Parliaments forthwith adds, that *Kings could not dissolve Parliaments till all grievances were redressed;*

and then where was the kings power to diſſolve, or the peoples confidence?

This is he ſayes *not only the aſſertion of this Parliament*, a ſtrong proofe, but *of our ancient lawe bookes*, that noe man ever read, *which averr it to be an vnwritten law of Common right ſoe engraven in the hearts of our Anceſtours, and by them ſoe conſtantly enjoyed, and claimed, as that it needed not enrolling.* this is pretty poetry, that becauſe a law is no where to be found, therefore it was engraven in the hearts of our Anceſtours, where are thoſe law bookes? But how many hundred yeares ſince was this engraving worne out, ſurely if there had been either ſuch an vnwritten law, and ſoe conſtantly enjoyed, and claimed, it would have been often enrolled ere now, but the libeller expected applauſe for his conceite, not creditt to his aſſertion.

If the Scotts could charge the King with breach of their lawes for breaking vp that Parliament without their conſent, it were vnreaſonable, that the wiſedome of England ſhould be ſoe wanting to it ſelfe, as not to provide againſt the not calling, or arbitrary diſſolving of Parliaments. If they had provided againſt it, where was the confidence he talked of? It followes not, that becauſe the Scotts charged the King with breaking of the Parliament without their conſent, that therefore the King offended in it, neither was the wiſedome of the Engliſh nation wanting to it ſelfe in leaving the calling, and diſſolving of Parliaments Arbitrary to the King, it being a power eſſentiall to Monarchy, and we have ſeene, that the taking away of that power diſſolves the Government, and drawes confuſion, and miſerie vpon the ſtate, and it cannot be avoyded, but that from a power erected to affront the ſoveraigntie, there muſt follow ſedition, and Civill diſcord. People muſt depend vpon their Kings grace, and goodnes for redreſſe of their greivances, whoſe power, and ſafetie conſiſts in their welfare, not ſeeke by violence to be their owne Carvers, and the people never found ſoe greate ſuffering by ſubmiſſion to their, Kings, as by ſeeking wayes to oppoſe them.

It appeares, that if this Bill of not diſſolving were an vnparalleld act, it was a knowne, and Common right. That it was an vnparalleld Act he doth not deny, that it was a Common right noe where appeares, and how can that be an vnparalleld Act, that is a Common right? He ſayes its not enrolled, and how then ſhall it appeare to be Common right?

What needed written Acts, when as it was anciently eſteemed part of his Crowne oath. His Crowne oath is well knowne, and may not be tryed by eſtimation, but inſpection. The libellers eſtimation hath as litle proofe, as authoritie. He referrs the *lawerlie mooting of this point to a booke called the rights of the Kingdome* written it ſeemes by ſome Author of as much fidelitie in his quotations, as this libeller in his narrations, and *to other law Tracts being neither his Element, nor proper worke, ſince the booke, which he hath to anſweare pretends to reaſon, not to Authoritie.*

And

And he holds *reaſon to be the beſt Arbitratour, and the law of law it ſelfe.* And it appeares by his writings, that reaſon is neither his Element, nor worke heere, for had he vſe of reaſon, he would not referr vs to bookes, that are onely of Authoritie to prove the ignorance, and boldnes of the writer, neither could reaſon judge it a law, that a king ſhould not diſſolve a Parliament, till all particular greivances were conſidered, though the ſetting of it might prove an incurable greivance, but his reaſon would have the Parliament defend the Kingdome with their votes, as the Roman Senatours their Capitall with their robes againſt the Gaules.

The King muſt not be at ſuch diſtance from the people in judging what is better, and what worſe. That the people are not the beſt judges of what is better, and what is worſe the libeller himſelfe acknowledges, ſaying they are exceſſive in all their motions, and is it not reaſon, that the King then ſhould be at ſuch diſtance in judging, but the libeller ſeekes to be at greate diſtance with truth, that ſayes the Kings owne words condemned him, that he had not *knowne as well with moderation to vſe as with earneſtnes to deſire his owne advantages.* Where as the King ſpake not of himſelfe, but others, his words were, *If ſome men had knowne as well with moderation to vſe, as with earneſtnes to deſire advantages of doing good, or evill.* Doth this man thinke reaſon the law of law, or falſhood the Maſter of both law, and reaſon, that ſoe palpably belyes the booke before him.

The King ſayes *a continuael Parliament, he thought would keepe the Commonwealth in tune.* To this ſayes the Libeller. *Iudge Commonwealth, what proofes he gave, that this boaſted profeſſion was ever in his thought.* The king doubtles thought not, that every Parliament would keepe the Commonwealth in tune, but a Parliament, that preferred publique good before private faction.

The King ſaith, as he relates him, ſome gave out, that I repented me of that ſetling Act. The Libeller ſayes, *his owne Actions gave it out beyound all ſuppoſition, for he went about ſoe ſoone after to abrogate it by the ſword.* Heere the Libeller omitts a materiall word, which the King vſed, which was *ſoone*, for the Kings words are, *that I ſoone repented.* It is well knowne that the wicked vſe, which the Traytours made of that *ſetling Act*, might give the king juſt cauſe to repent him of it, but as the king vſed not the ſword till many Moneths after the paſſing of that Bill, ſoe the cauſe of his Armes were the violent, and Trayterous Actions of a faction, not the abrogation of that Bill.

The King calls thoſe Acts, which he confeſſes tended to their good noe more Princely, then friendly contributions, as if ſayes the Libeller *to doe his dutie were of Courteſie, and the giving backe of our Liberties ſtood at the mercy of his contribution.*

He would have it beleived, that Parents can doe nothing for their childrens good out of favour, all is of dutie, and noe thankes belongs to them from their children, nor any from subjects to their Soveraignes, or rulers, for the greateſt benefitts they receive by good Government, and all the vigilance, watchfullnes, & pietie of Princes for the peoples good is not at all thankes worthy, theis are the Maximes of Rebells, and if Kings will not yeelde vp their power, they may be compelled, and the quitting of Government, for which Kings muſt give account to God, is by theis mens Divinitie the giving backe of liberties, being noe other, then to give licence to all wickednes, and beare the ſword in vaine.

The kings ſayes *he doubts not, but the affections of his people will compenſate his ſufferings for thoſe Acts of confidence.* To this ſayes the libeller, *not his confidence, but his diſtruſt brought him to his ſufferings, and he truſted nere the ſooner, for what he tells of their pietie, and Religious ſtrictnes, but rather hated them as Puritans, whome he allwayes ſought to extirpate.* The libeller himſelfe cannot deny, but that if the king had not had confidence, that thoſe Acts of his would not have beē abuſed, he would not have graunted them, for if he had not been ſo confident, it had been much more eligible for him to hav run the peril of a war without graunting them, and wee have ſeene by experience, that many as well as the king were deceived in thoſe, that profeſt *pietie, and Religious ſtrictnes*, and though the king had juſt cauſe to hate the faction of the hipocriticall Puritan, yet he thought, that there could not ſoe much impietie lurke in many vnder ſuch profeſſion *of pietie, and Religious ſtrictnes*, as hath ſince exceeded the moſt blaſphemous Atheiſt, and had the king ſooner diſtruſted, he had in humane reaſon prevented much of the Calamitie, that hath befallen himſelfe, and his kingdome.

That thoſe Acts of the Kings did not argue, that he meant peace knowing, that what he graunted out of feare, he might aſſoone repeale by force. It is noe argument, that he would doe it, becauſe he might doe it, but it is one of the libellers vſuall Arguments to conclude from the poſſibilitie to the being, and there cannot be a greater Argument of a mans deſire of peace, then to part with his right to prevent a warr, and by this rule of the libeller there muſt never be peace, nor end of Rebellion but by the deſtruction of the king, becauſe their guilt is ſtill vnſecure.

That the Tumults threatned to abuſe all acts of grace, and turne them into wantoneſſe. This ſayes the libeller *is abuſing of Scripture not becomming ſuch a ſaint to adulterate ſacred words from the grace of God to the acts of his owne grace.* And is it an abuſe of Scripture to ſay the King did Acts of grace? and whence then comes it to be an abuſe of Scripture to ſay the people abuſed the Kings grace, or turned it into wantoneſſe? was it not a ſin of wantoneſſe in the people and may it not be ſoe expreſt without any abuſe of Scripture. Scripture is abuſed, when it is applyed to a pro-

phane,

phane,& ludicrous ſenſe, but the words heere are not transferred from a right ſignification. There are diverſe words, that ſignifie both divine, and humane Actions, & there is noe abuſe of them in either ſenſe And the libeller having excepted to the vſe of an expreſſion of Scripture, preſently makes bold with Scripture ſaying, that *Herod was eaten vp with wormes for ſuffering others to compare his voyce to the voyce of God.* when as the Scripture ſayes, he was eaten vp of wormes, becauſe he gave not God the glory. And is not this to adulterate Scripture but nothing is ſacred to Rebells.

That *the King by this Phraſe gives jealoſie, that he likens his owne Acts of grace to the Acts of Gods grace cannot be* vnderſtood, noe more then the vſe of the name of mercy, or juſtice ſhould give jealoſie of likening humane vertues to divine Attributes, though there be a difference betweene reſembling, and comparing,

The libeller ſayes *from prophanes he ſcarce comes off with perfect ſenſe,* To prove, that he ſhewes himſelfe ſenſeles. The Kings words are, that *being not in a Capacitie to have taken revenge in a hoſtile way, he could not have given his Enemies a more deſired advantage, then by ſoe vnprincely inconſtancie, to have aſſaulted them with Armes, thereby to ſcatter them, whome but lately he had ſolemnely ſetled.* And where is the libellers exception? he ſayes *what place could there be for his inconſtancie to doe a thing, wherein he was in noe capacitie?* There was place for inconſtancie, if he had endeavoured to vndoe that, which he had done, though he were not in a capacitie to have effected it, and if the libeller had ſenſe he would not have miſſed it & come off without it.

He would not have, that conſiderations of hazard, and diſhonour, with-held the King from that courſe, and that he would prove, becauſe he made a warr, & yet objects feares to him for the cauſe of all his Actions, and from thence might well conclude that nothing but extreamitie cauſed him to defend himſelfe by warr.

The king ſayes *his letting ſomeone goe vp to the Pinnacle of the Temple was a temptation to them to caſt him downe headlong.* By this ſayes the libeller, he compares himſelfe to Chriſt who is not at all named. *The Parliament to the Devill*, which is not neither, and *that calling out his letting them goe vp to the Pinnacle of the Temple.* The libeller ſayes *its a goodly vſe of Scripture.* Similitudes of Actions imply noe Compariſons of perſons, but the congruitie of the alluſion made the libeller angry, and yet he may not be beleived, that the Actions of ſome Traytours, and particularly his Maſters may not be reſembled to that of Judas without comparing the perſon betrayed to Chriſt.

He ſayes, *it was noe Pinnacle of the Temple but a Nabucadnezars Pallace, from whence he, and Monarchy fell headlong together.* Thoſe Rebells have robbed, and ruined the Temple, as Nebucadnezar did, and they, that glory in caſting king, and Monarchy headlong have the ſpiritt of that tempter,

tempter, which perſwaded our ſaviour to caſt himſelfe downe. The people now, as theis of old finde it the extreamitie of deſolation to be without King, and Church, and it is an horrour to them, that the vncleane ſpiritts of Rebellion inhabite the Kings Pallaces.

The King ſayes *All the Kingdomes of the world are not worth gaining by wayes of ſin, which hazard the ſoule.* And ſayes the Libeller, *he left nothing vnhazarded to keepe three.* He hazarded nothing, but what he was bound to God, and his people for the preſervation of his Kingdomes, and theſe Rebells left noe wickednes vnattempted to gett them.

The Act of ſetling was noe ſin of his will, and the Libeller ſayes, *It was a ſin of his vnwillingnes.* But his falſhood is proved willfull in this, as in moſt of his aſſertions. The King confeſſes the ill conſequence of that Act, but he ſayes it was not a ſin of his will, becauſe it proceeded from other mens malice, and though he willingly paſt the Act, yet he judged the Evill enſuing, not the Act of his will, and it was a ſin of the Libellers will, that ſoe knowingly perverted his meaninge.

The Libeller ſayes, that *at his prayers, he had before him the ſad preſage of his ill ſucces.* And is it his fault to deſcerne his Enemies crueltie, and his owne afflicted condition?

But he ſayes *his prayer booke noe ſooner ſhutt, but other hopes flattered him, and that was his deſtruction.* Its not impoſſible, but he might have hopes, but his misfortunes will be the guilt, and deſtruction of them, that cauſed it without Gods greate mercie which they yet deſpiſe.

Vpon his

RETIREMENT

FROM

WESTMINSTER.

THe King ſayes, *I ſtaid at white hall till I was driven away by ſhame more then feare.* And ſayes the Libeller *in his Meſſages, and declarations, And in the whole Chapter next but one before this he affirmes, that the danger, wherein his wife, children, and his owne perſon were by theſe Tumults, was the maine cauſe, that drove him from white hall, and affirmes heere, it was ſhame more then feare, from whence, and the Ld. Digbies*

bies ſpeech to the ſame purpoſe, he ſayes, wee may deſcerne, what falſe, and frivolous excuſes are avowed for truth. We may ſee, how willfully, and abſurdly this Libeller will contradict truth, and himſelfe, that not only in one Chapter, but in every Chapter paſt vpbraids his Majeſt: with feares, boaſts, that by feares he was compelled to conſent to the death of the Earle of Strafford, and to paſſe thoſe Acts, for which he deſerved noe thankes, becauſe he did them for feare of the Tumults, and is now ſoe ſhameles to call them falſe, and frivolous excuſes.

The King formerly expreſt, *that valour is not to be queſtioned, for not ſcufling with the ſea, or an vndiſciplined rabble.* And though he had not a baſe feare he could not be vnapprehenſive ofviolence intended by that rabble, and it cannot be doubted, but that a King muſt have a greater meaſure of ſhame then feare to ſee ſuch inſolencies, and if this libeller had any ſhame, he would not have argued from that expreſſion of his Majeſt: a contradiction of what he ſaid of danger from theſe Tumults. But he thinkes his readers have a ſhort memory, as well as ſenſe, and therefore he reguards not the repugnancie of his owne Periods.

He magnifies *the courage, and ſeveritie of Zeale to Iuſtice in Rebells of former times*, and calls them *our fore Fathers*, and that their folly, & wickednes may have ſome excuſe in following ſubtile conſpiratours againſt their King, he calls it *courage, and ſeveritie of Zeale*, and that he may authorize their lewdnes, he ſayes their courage was againſt *the proud contempt, and miſrule of their Kings.*

He ſayes, *that when Rich. the 2. departed, but from a Committee of Lords, who ſate preparing matter for the Parliament, not yet aſſembled to the removal of his evill Councellours, they firſt vanquiſhed, and put to flight Robert de Vere, his cheife favorite, and then comming vp to London with a huge Army required the King, then withdrawne for feare, but noe further of then the Tower to come to Weſtminſter, which he refuſing they told him flatly, that vnles he came they would chuſe another.* And who can reade this relation, but muſt judge, that it was a Trayterous conſpiracie of theſe Lords, and a giddy, wicked Rebellion in the people? By what law was the king bound to attend theſe Lords, or what authoritie had they to prepare matter for the Parliament, more then any others of the Kingdome? Is it not a knowne Treaſon to endeavour to depoſe the King, and did not the late Parliament profeſſe to abhorre the thought of it? And how comes it to paſſe, that theſe Lords have a power to threaten the King with depoſing him? What Rebells can be convicted by any law, if this Action be not Treaſon? The libeller getts nothing by this example, but an evidence againſt his Maſters, for theſe Lords, and their aſſiſtants had their pardon for that Rebellion. And wherein did this Rebellion of theſe Lords differ from that of Jach ſtraw, and other Traytours mentioned by Mr. Sollicitour againſt the Earle of Strafford. His folly in ſeeking to draw an Argument from the Actions of Rebells, to prove a

Cryme in the King is ridiculous to any reaſonable man, and its not imaginable, that the king ſhould be bound to attend any meeting of his Peeres, and Councellours, which did tend towards a Parliament, for by that Rule he muſt attend in as many places, as there are factions noe ſober time ever pretended, that the king was bound to attend the Parliament, which was to be called, and diſſolved by him, and our Anceſtours would be eſteemed as voyde of reaſon, as loyaltie, if their Parliaments were governed by a Tumultuous rabble, and the king were oblidged to doe what they would have, though the whole kingdome were bleeding to death of thoſe wounds, which their impious, and inconſiderate violence, and fury had inflicted.

The king ſayes *the ſhame was to ſee the barbarous Rudenes of thoſe Tumulte to demaund any thing.* And this the libeller beleives was *the trueſt cauſe of his deſerting the Parliament.* And was it not a juſt cauſe for him to deſert the Parliament, or faction in it, when either they could not, or would not reſtrayne that barbarous rudenes.

The worſt, and ſtrangeſt of that any thing they demaunded was but the vnlording of Biſhopps, and expelling them the houſe, and the reducing of Church diſcipline to a conformitie with other Proteſtant. Churches. And this the libeller would have noe Barbariſme. What did the Parliament there, if the Tumults may demaund the alteration of the Government of Church, or ſtate? Can it be preſumed, that a rowte of Mechannicks could determine what, was conformitie to other Proteſtant Churches. The libeller at firſt remembred Mr. Solicitours diſcourſe againſt the Earle of Strafford, there he might have found, that it was Treaſon to goe about, & aſſemble a multitude to alter the Government of Church, or ſtate; And to ſeeke the vnlording of Biſhopps by force, in that manner they did was Treaſon by the law, and we have ſeene, that this deſperate rabble, whoſe demaunds the libeller ſayes were but the vnlording of Biſhopps, and the like thinke the murther of the king, and deſtruction of his family noe other then a but.

They were demaunded by the Parliament, which is vntrue, but they were demaunded by a factton, who ſuborned theſe Tumults to overaw, and drive away the greateſt part of the members of both houſes.

The King in a moſt tempeſtuous ſeaſon forſooke the helme, and ſteerage of the Common wealth. He withdrew himſelfe from that ſtorme, which the Traytours had rayſed againſt him, and admitted not any ſteerage, when all was whirled by tempeſtuous Tumults. The libeller would willingly mince the cauſes of his Majeſt: departure, and therefore he catches hold of the mention of ſhame to exclude feare, & from the barbarous rudenes of the Tumults to demaund any thing, he would conclude; there were only demaunds, & noe barbarous rudenes, and would make the laſt word to exclude all, that went before.

To be importuned the removing of evill Councellours, and other greivances was

to

to him an intollerable oppreſſion. To offer violence to him for his protection of faithful Councellours,& the ſupport of Government in Church, and ſtate was intollerable, and though the libeller doe commend the violence of the Tumults, yet heere he calls it only importunitie, and the Kings denyall of the impetuous demaunds of a rabble to change the Government in Church,and ſtate denyall, and delay of Juſtice. If violence be lawful,as he oftē affirmes,why doth he mince his defence, and ſoe often fly to theſe termes of importunitie, and petitioning?

The advice of his Parliament was eſteemed a bondage, becauſe the the King ſayes of them, *whoſe agreeing votes were not by any law concluſive to his judgment*,for ſayes the libeller,*the law ordaines a Parliament to adviſe him in his greate affaires, but if it ordaine alſo, that the ſingle judgment of a King ſhall outballance all the wiſedome of his Parliament, it ordaines that, which fruſtrates the end of its owne ordaining.* There is no doubt, but in a Monarchy the dependence of the people is vpon the King the greatenes of whoſe intereſt in the proſperitie of the Kingdome is more likely to oblidge him to their preſervation, then any number of private men can be encleined to,and as the law ordained a Parliament to adviſe him, ſoe it forbidds them to commaund,or preſcribe him,though the Major part of Parliament involve the whole, Its againſt all reaſon to include the King,who is allwayes furniſht by law with his other Councells,& may ſee good reaſon to preferr the Counſell of the ſmaller number,and that law, which ordained the Parliament to be called,and diſſolved by the King had deſtroyed what it ordained, if the King had been bound to conſent to all advices given him by the Parliament. Such a reſtraint vpon the King not only makes voyde, and vſeles thoſe ſelect Councells, which by law are continually to adviſe him,but deſtroyes the Government of Monarchy, which the law cannot intend, and gives the Parliament the abſolute ſoveraigntie,which the people would not live vnder being contrary to their deſires,and diſpoſitions,& the truſt repoſed in ſuch, as they elected.

The *Kings judgment may diſſent*, he ſayes, *to the deſtruction of himſelfe, and Kingdome*, And ſoe doubtles may the judgment of a major part in Parliament, and we have found by long experience, that Parliaments have produced Acts to the preiudice of the ſtate,and corruption of Religion, but this libeller holds all meanes fruſtraneous, that beget not Rebellion, and as in his affection he preferrs the judgment of the Parliament,before the Kings; ſoe any Company,or committee of Lords, that conſpire againſt him, as appeares by his late remembred inſtance againſt Rich: the 2: And what power he would have in the Parliament over the King, he would place in the Tumults,his admired Iron flaile over the Parliament,and prayes vnto God to ſend them,that they may purge the Parliament, and preſcribe lawes both to the King, and them,and therefore he judges,that it is vnlawlike, that *a remedy ſoe ſlen-*

der ſhould be the vtmoſt meanes of publique ſafetie. And we are ſure, that Rebellion, the only remedy, which he approves, is the deſtruction of al publique ſafetie, and ſhewes the Libeller as vnable to judge of law, as vnwilling to obey any.

He concludes, that *the Kings negative voyce was never a law, but a reaſonles Cuſtome growne vp from flattery, or vſurpation.* And how ſhall wee judge, that ſoe long a Cuſtome without contradiction was noe law? & that the contrary was an vnwritten law, and conſtantly enjoyed, & claimed. Can he thinke, that becauſe the ſupport of Rebellion is a ſubverſion of law, that therefore Rebells reaſons are the rule of law? And yet he is confident, it is *better evidence, then Rolls, and records*, & as they deale with law, ſoe with Scripture making their fantaſticke dreames, & Diabolicall infuſions the Canon of their Religion. And the Monarchy of David, and his ſucceſſours ordeined by God, and that had both a negative, and affirmative voyce, was a reaſonleſſe Cuſtome from flattery, or vſurpation.

He proceedes to ſhew the ſtrength of his Argument. *Becauſe the negative voyce is claimed to one man, not as a wiſe, or good man, but as a King.* And how doth he claime the power of the Parliament as to wiſe, or good men, or as to elected men? And it may be eaſily ſuppoſed, that the Major part of the Parliament may not be ſoe wiſe, and good, as their King, eſpecially ſoe aſſiſted by other Councells, as kings are, and it were noe *abuſive thing to Summon Parliaments*, though the King doe take their advices by weight, & not by number, but it were an abuſive thing, that ſuch, as were called to adviſe, ſhould take vpon them to determine.

The King ſayes. *The whole Parliament repreſents not him in any kinde.* To this ſayes the Libeller. *If the Parliament repreſent the whole kingdome, the king repreſents only himſelfe, and a king without his kingdome in a Civill ſenſe is nothing, nor without, nor againſt the repreſentative, and ſoe his negative as good, as nothing, and though we ſhould allow him ſomething, yet not equall to the whole kingdome, nor them, that repreſent it.* But what anſweare is this to the King, that being not repreſented, cannot be bound by the votes of them, that repreſent him not? Is the Libellers making him nothing, or not equall to the repreſentative any reaſon why he ſhould be bound by their votes? The King is by law, & reaſon the repreſentative of the Kingdome, & as this ſottiſh libeller cannot deny it out of Parliament, ſo he might well ſee, that the election of perſons to adviſe him, doth not take away that ſupream repreſentation, which the law hath given him. there can be nothing more abſurd, then that an elected company repreſenting ſubjects to their King, ſhould take away the Kingly repreſentation, & it is a ridiculous ſophiſtrie, that becauſe the king is not the ſubject, therefore he is without his kingdome. The people in Parliament are repreſented petitioning, and conſenting, not commaunding, and revolting, & it is repugnant to their condition to be equall, or not inferi-

our

our to their King, which were to destroy the relation of king, & subject.

The king maintaines *to be no further bound to agree with the votes of both houses, then he sees them to agree with the will of God, with his just rights, as a King, and the generall good of the people.* The Libeller would allow him freedome *with due bounds, but not, that he should have a negative, upon that, which is agreed by the whole Parliament.* Where are his bounds now? for if he have noe freedome, where they agree he hath none at al, for if they doe not agree, he can neither consent, nor dissent, but such poore sophismes are the reason of these popular Tribuns, and they will have both affirmative, and negative in the Tumults, but not in the King.

To know the will of God better then his whole Kingdome, whence should he have it? The Libeller doubtles will, affirme, that himselfe knowes the will of God better, then many whole Kingdomes, and why will he deny that possible to a King? I may aske him, why he should call the judgment of the Parliament, or a Major part of it, the judgment of the whole Kingdome, when the Major part of the Kingdome be of another minde, if because they represent it, then why may not the Kings judgment in the highest representation be preferred before theirs? If the Libeller were put to tell whenever such an Action had happened, that the king dissented from his whole kingdome, he would hardly finde it, when people have in greatest multitudes opposed their king, they were rarely, or never in the right.

To know the will of God better, then his whole kingdome, he askes, whence should he have it? Court breeding, he sayes, *and conversation of flatterers was a bad schole.* But conversation with Sectaries, & Rebels was worst of al, kings may be presumed to have better breeding, then any others, and the Libeller in another place argues from the kings breeding a greater expectation of abilitie. Flatterers are most hatefull to kings, and their principall breeding is to avoyde the insinuations of such deceivers, but the present faction have outdone all Court flatterers in falshood.

The king could not judge of his owne rights, but he had a right to keepe them, when they were judged. He sayes *the king had noe right by law to judge in any Court.* And yet he judged in all Courts, all judgments being in his name, and we are sure, that the lower house could never judge of the smallest cases, nor the higher, but in respect of the kings presence among them, because the king judges by his delegates doth he not judge, or can they judge his Crowne to themselves.

That *the king cannot judge of Treason, & fellony because he is held a partie.* And why did he then exclaime, that the king should hold noe Treasons, but against himselfe, but if that were the reason his Judges were incompetent, aswell as he, but it is necessary that in a learned profession, as the law, the king should judge by others.

The kings rights, he sayes, *must give place to generall good.* But it is

generall evill to take away his rights. He may not yeilde to Traytours, that desire him to part with them for their owne advantages. It is noe arrogance in a king to suppose a cleerer insight of the generall good, then others, though chosen for the Parliament, whose breeding, and condition could not quallifie them for such a descerninge, and it is a fond imagination in the Libeller to suppose the Parliament the kings Councell, and suppose the king voyde of Judgment to descerne the soundnes of their advice.

They have most authoritie to judge of the publique good, who for that purpose are chosen out, and sent by the people to advise him. But it necessarily followes, that he hath most authoritie, whome they are sent to advise, their authoritie being to advise, his to determine, and being sent to advise they destroy their owne authoritie, and office, when they Commaund.

If the King see oft the major part of them not in the right, it had been more his modestie to have doubted their seeing him more oft in the wrong. The libeller prescribes modestie to the king, insolence, & impudence to subjects, that the Rule of their Rebellion. If the king had not governed his Actions by good advice, nor seene the often Levitie, and precipitation of a Major part, he should have doubted of their seeing him in the wrong, however they owne him dutie, as their king, he no submission to them.

That the King ought to graunt the peoples rights, and liberties, because of right demaunded, it being his dutie, not his bountie to graunt these things. But it is the subjects miserie, aswell as their madnes to demaund the kings rights, as their owne, and we know, that the demaunds of Rebells are for themselves, and to take away the peoples rights, aswell as loyaltie, and wee finde, that there were such, as the king mentions, whome noe fountaine of Royall bountie was able to overcome, and for whome the comparision of hidropike thirst was very favourable being more insatiate then *gustlers* in a *wine* sellar, and neerer the nature of horse leaches, and swine.

The King confesses a rationall soveraigntie of soule, and freedome of within every man, and yet with an implicite repugnancie would make vseles that freedome of will in all other men but himselfe. That cannot be by vsing the libertie of his negative voyce, for are the wills of other men captivated becaus they cannot doe as they will, & becaus the king will not doe what they will have him, and becaus men are subject to Government is freedome of will denyed them?

Them, that yeilde him the obedience meaning the king, *he pronounces worthy to be slaves*, which he inferrs from these words of the King, the *he deserves to be a slave, who captivates the rationall soveraignetie of soule, and libertie of his will to compulsion.* And how can the libeller draw any such conclusion from these words? Lawes, that restraine Actions doe not captivate the will, nor doth he consent to have his will captivated, that sub-

ſubmitts to Government. But he captivates his will, that Acts what another directs him, though he judge it evill, and in ſuch caſe a law may not be obeyed, though violence may not be vſed againſt the law-maker.

What that Freedome is which cannot be denyed him as a King, becauſe it belongs to him as a man, & a Chriſtian the Libeller ſayes, *he vnderſtands not, if it be his negative voyce, it concludes all men, who have not ſuch a negative, as his againſt the whole Parliament, to be neither men, nor Chriſtians.* And aswell he might have ſaid, that becauſe every man ought to have freedome in giving his vote in Parliament, therefore every man ought to be there. The Libeller neede not be aſhamed to confeſſe ignorance, that bluſhes not at ſuch fooleries. The king argues, that he could not be debarred of that, as a king, which belonged to him as a man, and a Chriſtian, which was libertie of will in giving his vote, and by what Logicque could the Libeller thence conclude, that all, that have not a negative voyce to what the Parliament propounds are noe men, nor Chriſtians? If the king have not a negative voyce, he hath noe voyce, & every members of Parliament hath a voyce affirmative, & negative, and they deny that to the king in denying his negative voyce, which they allow all, that have any voyce.

He demaunds *what was he himſelfe all this while, that we denyed it him, as a King.* He had the freedome of his will, when he gave noe vote againſt it, but all the world ſayes that you were Traytours in the deniall. His naturall libertie of will was not taken from him by your Trayterous violence, though his right to vſe it in his kingly office were Rebelliouſly withſtood. If a King be prohibited the vſe of his reaſon in his Government, he is denied that, which belongs to him as a man, and a Chriſtian, and theſe impudent Traytours are ſoe cauterized, that they ſcoffe at their Lewde villany aſking whether he did not enjoy the libertie of his will, when they had impriſoned, and depoſed him.

He aſkes, *might not the King have enjoyed both reaſon, and conſcience governinge vs as free men, by what lawes we our ſelves would be governed?* And how could he governe, if you make the lawes, he might be governed? And who ſhall governe, when every man is a law-maker, and he could not enjoy reaſon, nor conſcience governing by lawes he approved not.

It was not the inward vſe of his reaſon, and conſcience, that would content him. Doubtles it ought not being a King, but ſayes he *to vſe them both as a law over all his ſubjects in whatſoever he declared as a King to like, or diſlike.* The King were noe King, if his ſubjects might make lawes without him, and his reaſon, and conſcience ought to be his lawes in governing, and he juſtly ſaid. *It were better to be without the Title of King, if it ſhould carry with it ſuch a vaſſallage, as not to ſuffer him to vſe his reaſon, and conſcience in what he declared as a King to like, or diſlike* which vſe of reaſon ſayes the libeller *moſt reaſonles, and vnconſcionable is the vtmoſt, that any*

Tyrant

Tyrant ever pretended over his vaſſalls. Tyrants were never eſteemed by their pretences, but by their Actions, & it ſhewes that theſe men knew not, what Tyrany was, who make a juſt right of all Governours, the vſe of reaſon Tyrany, and that, which never king was thought fitt to be denyed, though Tyrants abuſed it. Tyrany is in the abuſe of power, not in the rule of Government.

In all wiſe nations the Legiſlative power, and the judiciall execution of that power have been diſtinct. But never devided being allwayes ſubordinate one tothe other, the judiciall execution depending on the Legiſlative.

He makes an aſſumption, *If then the king be only ſett vp to execute the law he ought noe more to make, or forbidd the making of any law, then other inferiour Iudges.* But if the king be ſet vp to make law by the advice of his Councell the Parliament, can they make lawes without him, but this Libeller, that would be thought ſoe ſtrong at Arguments, talkes himſelfe into contradictions, and allowes the king, neither the one power, nor the other, for he affirmes the king cannot judge, and make lawes he muſt not, and what will he conclude, ſure, that his owne nation is not wiſe, nor himſelfe honeſt, or rationall.

He cannot reject a law offred him by the Commons, no more then make a law, which they reject. And hath it ſenſe, that becauſe a man cannot doe an Act without the advice of another, therefore he muſt doe what that other adviſes? The man dictates, and would be beleived, though the Commons never did, nor could offer a law to the king, for he wel knowes it muſt paſſe the Lords before it come to the king, but he was loath to mention the Lords, leaſt it ſhould cry downe the noyſe he hath made of the kings ſingle judgment, for the Lords houſe may not have a negative in his judgment, notwithſtanding their number. But why is it offred the king, if he may not reject it, and whence hath it been, that ſo many Bils have been rejected in al ages, without any complaint.

When Kings come ſoe low as to fall vpon Philoſophy, which before he neither valued, nor vnderſtood is a ſigne they are then put to their laſt trump. If the king had not valued nor vnderſtood Philoſophy, he could not have made ſoe pertinent vſe of it, and if the Libeller had vnderſtood Philoſophy, or valued truth, he would have given better ſignes of it. Could not his Majeſt: *diſcourſe of his reaſon, and will, but it muſt be out of the way, or above his abilitie.* But why is this a ſigne, that kings are then put to their trump, why the vſe of Philoſophy more then other, learning? Though kings come low, Rebells will come to ſeeke corners to hide themſelves. He ſhewes not how Philoſophy breakes the necke of their cauſe, or how he hath made advantage of Philoſophy againſt the king, but we finde how his elaborate contradictions, have broken the necke of his owne cauſe through out all his diſcourſes.

The king ſayes he *cannot thinke the Majeſt: of the Crowne of England to be bound by any Coronation oath in a blinde, and brutiſh formalitie to conſent to whatever its ſubjects in Parliament ſhall require.* And ſayes the Libeller, *What Tyrant could preſume to ſay more.* And the law it ſelfe, Religion, and reaſon never ſaid leſſe.

It

It cannot but be yeilded, that the oath, which bindes him to performance of his truſt, ought in reaſon to containe the ſumme of what his cheiſe truſt, and office is. But what if it doe not, is there an argument to be drawne from what the oath ought to be, but is not? The oath may containe the generall dutie of Juſtice, & right, but it neither did, nor could comprehend all the wayes of effecting it.

The libeller ſayes, that *the Kings negative voyce is not contained in that oath.* But that oath oblidges him to governe by juſt lawes, which comprehends a negative to all vnjuſt lawes, and can it impoſe an obligation vpon the king of doing Juſtice, and not give him a libertie of judging what is juſt, or vnjuſt?

The Libeller ſayes, that *his oath requires only his aſſent to thoſe lawes, which the people have already choſen, or ſhall chuſe*, there is noe ſuch word in that oath, and his mention of the Lattine, and old Engliſh of that oath are of another ſenſe, & that the libeller was conſcious of, & therefore he ſayes. *All reaſon admits, that the people ſhould not looſe vnder a new king what freedome they had before.* but their freedome conſiſts not in an exemption from ſoveraigne power. It is the cuſtome of Rebels to contradict, & corrupt al lawes vpō pretence of their private reaſon, & allow no reaſon but what concludes againſt juſt authoritie, he wel knew there was not that double ſenſe he aſſignes, but we wil make his ſens the kings oath: if the peoples choiſe be referred to the time paſt, it implies not, that their choiſe was or ought to be a law, though they had a choiſe in the laws made, as ſtil they have, & they could not looſe what they never had, & the Parliament, which at firſt mētioned the kings oath acknowledged, *that as they did not determine the queſtiō how far foorth the king is oblidged, to follow the judgmēt of his parliament, ſo as to conclude that a new law might be mad without his conſent.* ſo they acknowledge that *the contrary may be truly inferred out of al they had ſaid.*

That *if the King deny what the Parliament hath choſen, he makes himſelfe ſuperiour to his whole Kingdome.* And who doubts but he is? doe not they which take the oath of ſupreamacie acknowledge it? The libeller ſayes *the generall maximes of Policie gainſay it.* The general maximes of Rebellion doe, but Policy cannot. It is impoſſible in Policy, that he to whome every ſoule muſt be ſubject, ſhould not be ſuperiour to them all.

Our owne ſtanding lawes gainſay it, as hath been cited in Remonſtrances that the King hath two ſuperiours, the law, and his Court of Parliament. The merit of thoſe remonſtrances are neere the rate of this libell, though as yet they never mentioned ſuch ſtanding lawes, & if there had been ſuch ſtanding lawes the Author would have found them enrolled, but that he doth not, & how abſurdly ſuch a pretence is obtruded, whē the ſuperiotie of perſōs, & places is in queſtiō to name the ſuperiority of law, which holds compariſō with ſciences, not with perſōs, & that the Parliament ſhould be above the king, who is the head of the Parliament, without whom a Parliament hath no being is as Monſtrous to reaſō, as law, & it is impoſſible that the law cā ſay, that the king hath no ſuperiour but God, & ſay, that the Parliament is his ſuperiour, & the king might wel ſay, that this was blinde, & brutiſh formalitie, and no part of the law, his oath, or dutie, but ſuch brutiſh formalities Rebells vſe to blinde the people.

The King, and Peers repreſent only themſelves, the Commons are the whole Kingdome. Which is as apparently falſe, as that the Common Councell, of London are the whole kingdome, & the commons in Parliament have no power from the people, to doe any thing without the king, & Lords.

Infinite miſcheifes may grow while our ſafetie ſhall depend vpon the over weening reaſon of one man. And we finde by experience, that deſperate ruine inevitably followes, when our ſafetie depends vpon the agreement of a multitude. It is the nature of ſectaries to be wiſe in their owne conceite, and thence come arrogance, and contempt of Government, & it is a principall in their ſchiſme to improve this naturall inſolence, and contemne all Eſtates, and abilities of men diſſenting from them, & though his Majeſt: were of moſt eminent natural endowments this libeller cals him *a man neither by nature, nor nurture wiſe.* Which ſhewes he vnderſtood not wiſedome in others, nor was ſenſible of his owne folly ſoe apparent to all his readers. That a King ſhould want breeding to make him wiſe, is ſtrange in the libellers owne judgment, and that the experience, & breeding of the King was eminently extraordinary the world well knowes.

He calls the *Kings negative his will, & the Parliaments demaunds advice.* May not their demaunds be willfull, and his negative adviſed? The nature, and nurture of this libeller is diſobedience, and therefore will have the Kings wiſedome to be will, & the Rebells raſhnes wiſedome, and it is impoſſible, that men, who have ſucked in ſuch principles ſhould ever be obedient to any Government, ſtudying only how they may diſaffect ſubjects to it.

He ſayes *the Kings errour was imperious, and force was vſed not to diſpell errour out of his head, but to drive it from of our neckes.* Theſe Rebells ſought to be imperious, & put the yoke vpon the neckes of the people, and that, which reſtrained them from an abſolute arbitrary power, which was the Kings negative, they would take away by force, and place negative, and affirmative in themſelves. The libeller ſayes well that force was not vſed to diſpell errour, which was vſed to enforce conſent, and to make errour, and ſhewes their wickednes, that tooke that courſe.

The King ſayes *the vprightnes of his intention will excuſe the poſſible failings of his vnderſtanding, who ſeriouſly endeavours to ſee the beſt reaſon, & faithfully followes it. This* the libeller ſayes *is a poſition falſe in law, & Divinitie.* But for that we muſt take his word againſt all law, & Divinitie. But he ſayes its contrary to the Kings owne better principles, who affirmes *the goodnes of a mans intention will not excuſe the ſcandall, and contagion of his Example.* And doth it contradict what the king had ſaid, of the excuſe of errour in judgment, by the vprightnes of the intention, becauſe a man cannot excuſe an evill Action by the intending a good end, where there was noe errour of the fact, but a knowne evill.

His not knowing through corruption of flattery, & Court principles will not excuſe him. But we are ſure, that this libellers willfull falſ hoods, corrupt, and Rebellious principles condemne him, and make him odious to God, and man, and he is not like a Pilot mi'ſled by a wandring ſtarr, that

that may be possible, but like a Pilot, that will not be giuded by starrs, but maliciously destroyes the ship, and men, and this Author might sooner excuse a drunken Pilot, then a savage Piratte, and such are they, who willfully practise deceites, and cruelties vnder the name of *nationall rights.*

They vsed force to acquit their owne reason, and conscience from force That is they vsed force to Domineere over king, and people, and establish their owne will for law. And to rebell against their king is to arquit their reason and conscience.

The king sayes *never thing pleased him more, then when his judgment concurd with theirs.* The libeller to this sayes. *That was to the applause of his owne judgment, and would aswell have pleased any selfe conceited man.* But could the king despise the judgment of the Parliament, as this addle headed libeller continually exclaimes, and make it matter of applause to himselfe, that his judgment concurd with theirs? Could he sleight their judgment, and conceite his owne credited by their concurrence? If he had noe other esteeme of their judgment, then the libeller would have beleived, doubtles he might have suspected his owne Judgment, for concurring with theirs; And whence comes itt, that a selfe conceited man would be soe well pleased with such a concurrence? A selfe conceited man scornes the concurrence of other mens judgments, and preferrs his owne against all others, but reason cannot be expected from this man being vse les to his vndertaking.

The king sayes *in many things he chose rather to deny himselfe then them.* And sayes the libeller. *That is to say Trifles, for of his owne interests, and personall rights he conceives himselfe Master.* And who can deny itt, but he is Master of them, and yet he hath parted with these, and could he part with any thing wereof he was not Master? And were all these lawes, which the libeller commends, trifles?

To part with if he please saith the Libeller, *not to contest for against the Kingdome, which is greater then hee, whose rights are all subordinate to the Kingdomes good.* If he may not contest for them, he must part with them, though he please, or not please, but being for the Kingdomes good, he is bound to contest for them, and it is to ruine the Kingdome, when subjects contest to take them away from the King. Those rights are in compatible with subjects, and inseperable from Governours, and are noe more subordinate to the peoples good, then Justice, or law are, but they are the peoples good, and the people are subordinate to their Rulers in judging what is their good. But he must part with them because the Kingdome is greater then he, as the Libeller sayes, That is noe reason, but it is according to the Rebells principles, that there is no right, but force, & the weaker may not contest against the stronger.

The libeller is very copious in his declamations against Monarchy, and it would be tedious to follow him in his verbositie, he excepts to

theſe words of the King. *In what concernes truth? Iuſtice, the right of Church, or his Crowne, noe man ſhall gaine his conſent againſt his minde.* And ſayes the libeller. *What can be left then for a Parliament, but to ſit like Images, whileſt he aſſumes the beſt abilitie of judging, or reſtraynes all men from enjoyment of any good, which his judgment thinkes not fit to graunt them.* And what were a King but an Image, if he were bound to graunt, whatſoever his ſubjects in Parliament demaund of him, and to what end doe they take an oath of Alleagiance, if he were bound to quit it, when they aſke it? And are there any ſoe ſunke in vnderſtanding, as to beleive, that it is the office of a King to judge of nothing, and the right of ſubjects in Parliament to commaund al things. But this man is of Achitophells minde, that if his Councell be not followed, he will goe home, & hang himſelfe. Advice from ſubjects to a King is ordained by law, but the ſubjection of a King to adviſe is monſtrous, and vnſuppoſable. The Authors repetitions of rayling Epithites vpon what concernes the King, or his Actions, & commendation of the wicked Actions againſt him, will not alter the nature of one or other, and his vehement aſſeveration, that *the law, and Coronall oath require the Kings vndeniable aſſent to what lawes the Parliament agree vpon*, is not out of opinion of truth, but the ſtrength of his language himſelfe ſhewing the contrary aſwell as the Parliament.

The King ſayes *he had rather weare a Crowne of thornes with our ſaviour, then to exchange that of gold for one of lead, whoſe imbaſt flexiblenes ſhalbe forced to binde, and comply to the various, & oft contrary Dictates of any faction, when inſteede of reaſon, & publique concernement they obtrude nothing, but what makes for the intereſt of parties, and flowes from the partialitie of private wills, & paſſions.* The libeller ſayes *many would be all one with our ſaviour, whome he will not know. They who governe ill thoſe Kingdomes, which they have right to, have to our ſaviours Crowne of thornes noe right at all.* Such as are Rebells to lawfull Princes, & vſurpe Kingdomes, will never weare a Crowne of thornes with their ſaviour, nor can hope to be knowne by him, while they ſucke the blood of his anointed, and Tyranize over kingdomes ſoe wickedly gotten. That Crowne of thornes, which this libellers ſavage ſouldiers, and others ſet vpon the laſt king, is now his Crowne of rejoycing in heaven, & honour among men, & the infamy of theſe helliſh miſcreants. The libeller twiſts thornes, and ſnares for himſelfe by his ſhameles Calumnies, ſeeking to make the aſſaſſination of a gracious king his owne demeritts.

A Crowne of gold is not due to him, who cannot firſt weare a Crowne of lead, not only for the weight of that greate office, but for the compliance with them, who are to Councell him. A leaden Crowne may well expreſſe ſtupiditie, and baſenes, and the Crowne of gold better agrees with ſound Councell, which is compared to apples of gold in pictures of ſilver, then lead which ſhewes only *that imbaſt flexiblenes to the various, and oft contrary Dictates of any faction*, and is only a weight of puniſhment, not of office, which

which the gold repreſents, but Traytours cannot endure a Crowne of gold vpon the head of their king, they will only allow him a Crowne of thornes, or lead.

The libeller taxes the king *for want of modeſtie, in imputing want of reaſon, and neglect of the publique, rather to the faction then to himſelfe, becauſe the faction was the Parliament.* And he muſt be a man voyde of all modeſtie, that doth not judge ſuch Actions as the king complayned of *to proceede from want of reaſon, & neglect of the publique, intereſt of parties, & partialities of private will, and paſſion.* The ſectaries were wont to deprecate all accuſations of irreverence to their King, and complaine, that they were wronged, but the queſtion is now changed, & contempt of the King is their greate vertue. The libeller throughout this whole diſcourſe rejects the conſideration of the Kings conſcience, & heereto theſe words of the Kings *I know noe reſolutions more worthy a Chriſtian King, then to preferre his conſcience before, his Kingdomes*, ſayes *the ſentence is faire in ſeeming, but fallacious, for the conſcience may be ill edifred.* And becauſe it may be ſoe, is it fallacious, that conſcience muſt be preferred before Kingdomes? Theſe hipocrites, that pretend to Rebell for their conſcience, accuſe the king for refuſing to paſſe a law, in regard of the contrary perſwaſion of his conſcience, and it muſt be an ill edified conſcience in him to forbeare an act, & a rightly informed conſcience in them, that commit an act ſo bloody, & ſcandalous to the whole world, & ſo dangerous to the ſoules of many, that were drawne headlong into that ſin, the Kings conſcience cannot be preſerved without his negative voyce, and therefore he might juſtly aſſert it to be his right by law, & when the libeller can perſwade men, that Parliaments are infallible, and free from faction, & that Rebells are beſt judges, of what is for the Kingdomes good, he may hope to be beleived, that the king denyed that, which law, his oath, and office bid him graunt. And all men ſee, that vnder the name of the advice of Parliament, Rebels have introduced their owne wils for lawes.

Vpon the

QUEENES DEPARTURE.

WHat concernes it vs heere to heare a husband divulge his houſhold privacies, extolling to others the vertues of his wife, an infirmitie not ſeldome incident to thoſe, who have leaſt cauſe, Juſt Teſtimony to vertue is never an infirmitie, but neceſſary from the husband, where conjugall affection hath derived the hatred of his Enemies to his wife.

If the divulging of houshold privacies concerned him not, it is his lewdenes to take occaſions of deriſion, & baſe language from it. Treaſons to the minde are as peſtilence to the body, that turnes all diſeaſes into its owne malignant humour, for this Libeller cannot forbeare deſpite to the King for ſpeaking that, which he ſaith doth not concerne others, nor to the Queene for being named.

How good a wife ſhee was to himſelfe, how bad a ſubject is not much diſputed, And to whome was ſhee a ſubject, to the Rebells? Thoſe that acknowledge themſelves ſubjects to the King, wil have the Queene eſteemed a bad ſubject for her Zeale to his State, and ſafetie, theſe evill ſpiritts, that poſſeſſe the Rebells perſwade men, that it is a fault to be bad ſubjects, and yet will allow none to be ſubjects, but the King, his wife, and children.

It neede be made noe wonder, though ſhee left a Proteſtant Kingdome with as litle honour, as her mother left a Popiſh. This mention of her mothet ſhewer the extenſion of a Trayterous malice, that ſpares noe relations, nor conditions though vnconcerned. Thoſe, that compelled the Queenes departure did more contribute to the diſhonour of a Proteſtant Kingdome, & the Proteſtant Religion, whereof they take the name without the truth, then the greateſt Enemy to the Proteſtant Religion could have effected, what the caſe of her mother was wee enquire not, but the world ſees, that theis injuries to her Majeſt: exceeded example, & Rebells injuſtice fixes noe diſhonour, but on themſelves.

The king ſayes *this is the firſt example of any Proteſtant ſubjects, that have taken vp Armes againſt their King a Proteſtant.* The Libeller ſayes *it can be to Proteſtants noe diſhonour, when it ſhalbe heard, that he firſt leavied warr on them, and to the intereſt of Papiſts more then of Proteſtants.* But then it is diſhonour, if he firſt leavied not warr vpon them? And all that reade his booke muſt conclude, that they firſt leavyed warr vpon him, what els doth he meane by defending the Tumults, ſeizing the forts, and Militia, rayſing an Army, & vpbraiding the king with feares to hazard ſuch a ſcuffle. But were it otherwiſe, the Proteſtants have diſclaimed his Trayterous pretence of taking Armes againſt the King vnder colour of Religion, or otherwiſe, & hold it diſhonour to their Religion, that ſuch Rebellious principles ſhould be charged vpon them, and nothing could be more for the intereſt of Papiſts, then that Proteſtants ſhould maintaine, and practice that doctrine of Rebellion. The world is ſatisfied, how diſloyally the King was proſecuted by Armes, and had it been otherwiſe, ſubjects ought to petition not returne violence, and in all the excuſes that theſe Traytours have vſed, they never mention any offer of ſatisfaction to the King, or deſire to lay downe his Armes, but require his ſubmiſſion, and giving vp his rights, or otherwiſe they would take it by force. The precedence of the Scotts warr will not take of the diſhonour.

He

He ſayes, *Its a groundles, and diſſembled feare, that ſhee, that was for many yeares averſe to her husbands Religion ſhould be now the more alienated,* & can the Libeller deny, but that the averſion of any may be encreaſt, and confirmed by the wickednes of the perſons of the contrary Religion, how groundles then, and ſhameles is his exception?

If the feare of her delinquencie, and Iuſtice demaunded on her, was any cauſe of her alienating the more, to have gained her by indirect meanes, had been no advantage to Religion. As the King obſerved, that this was the firſt example of Proteſtant ſubjects, that tooke Armes againſt their king: ſoe this of charging the Queene with Delinquencie was the firſt example in that kinde, that trayterous impudence had produced, & when it ſhalbe heard, that a compaine of ſuch vile perſons charge the Queene with Crymes fot aſſiſting her husband, they wilbe aſſured, that not feare of Delinquencie, but their barbarous crueltie might more alienate her, & diſadvantage Religion. *Them, who accuſed her* he ſayes *well enough knowne to be the Parliament, the King cenſures, for men yet to ſeeke their Religion, whether doctrine, diſcipline, or good manners.* And ſoe doth the whole world, whatever name the Libeller give ſuch men, who are well enough knowne to be a Trayterous faction.

The name of true Engliſh Proteſtants is a meere ſchiſmaticall name. And why? Are there not ſeverall confeſſions in the Proteſtant Churches, & doe they hold one another Schiſmatickes for that reaſon? How often hath this Libeller named the beſt reformed Churches, is not that as much a name of ſchiſme? he is ignorant in the nature of ſchiſme, though he be ſoe well practiſed in it, and its ſtrange he would obſerve a Schismaticall name from the title of a nation, and not from his title of Independencie, that produceth as many titles, and diſtinctions, as there be Pariſhes, or Parlours.

The King aſcribes rudenes, and barbaritie worſe then Indian to the Engliſh Parliament. To the Libellers Parliament he very well may. He ſayes *the King aſcribes all vertues to his wife vndervaluing the greate Councell of his Kingdome in compariſon of one woman.* And not only he, but all good men abominate that wicked Councell, which vſed ſuch rudenes, and barbaritie towards her, and from hence the Libeller tells vs *there are examples of miſcheife vnder vxorious Magiſtrates, and Feminine vſurpation.* And muſt Magiſtrates therefore have noe wives, or noe affections to them? And the examples of feminine vſurpation are more frequent in Republican Tribunes then Monarchs.

The king ſayes, *her tarrying heere he could not thinke ſafe among them, who were ſhaking hands with Allegiance to lay faſter hold on Religion.* The Libeller ſayes that *he taxes them of a dutie rather then a Cryme, it being juſt to obey God rather then man.* And is periury, and the breach of Alleagiance obedience to God, and doe men obey God, that breake one Commaundement vpon pretence to keepe another. The Scripture tells vs he that brea-

breakes one Commaundement is guiltie of all, but theſe are they, that ſay they love God, and yet hate their brother, hate and kill their King Gods vicegerent.

The libeller ſayes *it was the fault of their courage, that they had not quite ſhaken of, what they ſtood ſhaking hands with.* Its like their conſcience, and Religion were not the cauſe they did not, but the Libeller was not of their Councell, for the time required they ſhould keepe their maske longer.

He is offended at the Kings prayer, *that the diſloyaltie of his proteſtant ſubjects may not be a hindrance to her love of the true Religion*, and ſayes that *he never prayes, that the diſſolutenes of his Court, the Scandalls of his Clergie, vnſoundnes of his owne judgment, Lukewarmenes of his life, letter of compliance to the Pope, permitting his nuntio heere, may not be found farr greater hindrances.* All theſe put togeather are farr ſhort of the ſcandall of the diſloyaltie of his ſubjects. The Court diſſolutenes is made a common place of ſcandall, not veritie in reſpect of the application, there being not ſuch exceſſes in his Majeſt: Court, that deſerved a ſpeciall obſervation, and the reſtraint of diſſolutenes was more obſervable, then the Cryme. As to the ſcandalls of his Clergie, though we muſt beleive, that offences wil come, yet the ſcandall of the preſent diſloyaltie was more offenſive to thoſe of different Religion, then any diſorders in Civil converſation, and the injuſtice of the Rebells towards the Clergie, hath ſhewed the vntruth of the ſcandalls, that were caſt vpon them, & though their malice traduced, & perſecuted them, their proofes could not convict them of the ſcandall ſuppoſed. His Majeſt: owne judgment cannot be overcaſt by a Rebells malice, and his examplary life cannot be ſtained by a Libellers pen. His letter to the Pope was noe complaince, nor could it give offence to proteſtant or hope to Papiſt, & theſe Rebells, that comply with Turkes, and infidells leaſt of all thinke it a compliance. The Libeller well knowes there was noe nuntio in England, and if the King ſhould have denyed the Queene the exerciſe of her Religion, whereto he was bound by the Articles vpon the match, he had given greater ſcandall by breaking the Articles, then by permitting her the repaire of perſons in matters of her Religion. But ſayes the Libeller, *they muſt not ſit ſtill*, that is not Rebell, *and ſee their Religion ſnatcht away* But they have Rebelled to ſnatch away Religion. He ſayes, *Its knowne, that her Religion wrought more vpon him, then his vpon her, and his favouring of Papiſts, and hatred of Puritans, made men ſuſpect ſhee had perverted him.* Noe doubt ſuſpitions were induſtriouſly rayſed, and carrefully nouriſht againſt the King, though they beleived them not, that made vſe of them. The King was not bound to deſtroy all Papiſts, and could not deny them the protection of a King, & he had juſt reaſon to ſuſpect thoſe bloody Puritans, whoſe inclinations he deſcerned to that wickednes they have ſince avowed.

From

From his ſuppoſitions he aſcends to his exclamations. *What is it, that the blindenes of hipocriſie dare not doe? It dares pray, and thinke to hide that from the eyes of God, which it cannot from the open view of men.* We finde this very frequent in this Author, and in this very Period, that in contempt of God, & men, charges the King with Crymes he not only knew falſe but which are ſoe knowne vnto the whole world, and conclude againſt his owne narrations, and others view.

Vpon his repulſe

AT

HULL,

and the fate of the

HOTHAMS.

HE makes an introduction, that *Hull was the Magazine of Armes, which the king had bought with money illegally extorted from his ſubjects.* He thinkes, that if goods be ill gotten, its lawfull for him, and his Sectaries to rob him, that poſſeſſes them, els to what vſe is it mentioned with what money the King bought theſe Armes? But had the king noe meanes to procure Armes but by illegall exaction? ſure that will conduce litle to the Apollogy of this breaker, that Calumniates the King ſoe much for ſeeking meanes from his ſubjects for publique ſafetie.

Next he ſayes *theſe Armes were bought to be vſed in a cauſeles, and moſt vnjuſt Civill warr againſt Scotland.* What was the warr in Scotland, to Hothams taking of Hull, or ſeizing the Magazine, when the warr was ended? Rayling will neither make the warr vnjuſt, nor the mention of it heere any way extenuate the vſurpation, but ſhewes the barrennes of his matter by his repeated inſignificant falſhoods.

The Queene he ſayes *was gone to Holland to ſett to ſale the Crowne Iewells a Cryme heeretofore counted Treaſonable in Kings.* Its like ſuch a Treaſon, as he makes to buy a Magazine of Armes to reſiſt an invader, he ſhould have done well to have told, when this heeretofore was. Its likely they that held it Treaſon in Kings to have ſold Jewells of the Crowne would

have made it ſome Cryme to have bought Jewells for the Crowne, and it is noe Treaſon now to ſell the Crowne, Jewells, and all by his cut throate crew.

The Parliament was not ignorant to what intent theſe ſumms were rayſed. their owne actions told all the world they were neceſſary to be rayſed.

The Kings refuſing to ſettle the military power in truſtie hands vpon their petitions, and doubting he would poſſeſſe himſelfe of Hull, they were neceſſitated by the turbulence, and danger of the times of their owne authoritie, to putt the Kingdome into a poſture of defence, and to ſend Sr. Iohn Hotham to take Hull into his poſſeſſion. How many lewde lyes have they ſent abroade into the world, that the King made warr vpon them, and it was the Libellers owne pretence in the beginning of the laſt Chapter, & now plainly tells they ſeized Hull, becauſe they ſuſpected the King intended it, and becauſe he would not ſettle the militia, as they deſired. If he had no power over the Militia, why did they petition him? If the Parliament be his ſuperiour why did they petition at all? Doe ſuperiours petition inferiours? But what was that turbulence, & danger of the Kingdome, was there any more, then what themſelves had made by rumours, and Tumults, and is not the ſeizing of a fort an Act of warr?

The King had attempted the ſame before. And was that any cauſe for them, becauſe the King ſends to his Caſtles, or forts, muſt they therefore take them from him? And he ſayes *letters of the Lord Digby were intercepted, wiſhing the King to retire to ſome ſafe place.* And therefore theſe Rebells would provide he ſhould be ſafe in noe place.

The King offred to goe in perſon into Ireland, and that he would Arme his guard from his Magazine of Hull. The Parliament he ſayes *foreſeeing the kings drift petition him, that they might have leave to remove the Magazine of Hull to the Tower of London.* Soe carefull they were to have the Rebellion in Ireland proceede, that they deſired his Majeſt: to forbeare his going into Ireland out of conſideration of danger to his perſon, when as they intended to deſtroy him at home, and the true cauſe was, that they would deteine theis Armes to make warr againſt him, if he would not ſubmitt to be depoſed, and to keepe the money given for Ireland to drive on the warr heere.

The King afterward going to Hull required the Governour to deliver him the Towne, whereof the Governour humbly deſired to be excuſed, till he could ſend to the Parliament. It ſeemes the libeller would not have that a denyall.

The King proclaimed Hotham Traytour before the Towne walls And noe man dobuted, but he was ſoe.

The King gave order to ſtopp all paſſages betweene him, and the Parliament. And had he not reaſon to prevent ſupplies, and intelligences to a Traytour?

Yet ſayes the Libeller *he demaunded Iuſtice, as vpon a Traytour, vſing a ſtrange iniquitie to require Iuſtice vpon him, whome he had debarred from his*

appa-

apparence. Traytours muſt be apprehended before their apparence, and it was a ſtrange iniquitie in them, that would not apprehend a Traytour, as in Juſtice they ought, but a moſt execrable impietie in ſuch as pretend Juſtice, to cleere a malefactour without hearing both parties, as the libeller ſayes *the Parliament did Sr. Iohn Hotham*, for he ſayes *the Parliament noe ſooner vnderſtood what had paſſed, they declare Sr. Iohn Hotham had done noe more, then was his dutie*. They meant noe doubt his dutie to them, as fellow Traytours, not to his king, and ſoveraigne.

That this proves that to be falſe, which is heere affirmed by the King, that his greateſt Enemies had ſcarce confidence enough to abett, or owne it. And ſuch, as knew the manner of their proceedings at that time, know the truth of what the King affirmes, and though the neceſſitie of their engagement made them owne it, yet there were very few, or none, that eſteemed it an act of Juſtice in them, but of Policie for their owne ſecuritie. The king ſayes *it affected him more with ſorrow for others, then anger for himſelfe, nor did the affront trouble him ſoe much, as their ſin*. The libeller ſayes, *there is vſe of this booke to ſhew vs what a deluded thing the creature is, which is called the vulgar, who will beleive ſuch vaine glories as theſe*. And ſurely we cannot beleive any creature ſoe deluded, as thoſe, for whoſe capacitie the libeller writes, that makes the deluded vulgar judges of lawes, and kings, yet heere ſpurnes it as a deſpiſed creature.

The ſtrangenes of beleife that he imagines, as that the King proclaimed him Traytour without due proces of law. If he could have told what the due proces of law was, no doubt he would. If a theife, or murtherer be taken in the Act, or eſcape, muſt there not be a proclamation for his apprehenſion? If Traytours be in Armes againſt their King, is it choler, or raſhnes to proclaime them Traytours?

The King had lately been convinced of his illegallitie with the five members. He was injuriouſly denyed Juſtice againſt them, which produced the ſecond inſolence of Hotham.

The Kings relation declares his anger to be incenſed, as he had, but doth it follow from thence, that he was not more ſorry for others, then angry? May not a fathers ſorrow for his ſons diſobedience, exceede his anger, and may not a King deſire the puniſhment of a Malefactour, becauſe he pitties his perſon, & greives for the ill conſequence of his offence? Yet this trifling Libeller, would inferr, that the king could not be more ſorry, then angry, becauſe his words teſtifie *impatience of delay till Hotham be puniſhed*.

Its a ſtrange operation of ſorrow, that ſtirred him ſoe vehemently to have Hotham puniſhed, and not to have him repent. But this exception is more ſtrange, that a man may not be vehement for the puniſhment of one, for whoſe offence he is greived, and there may be juſt cauſe of ſorrow, for an Act, which the repentance of the Actour cannott remedy. He knowes well how litle his Majeſt: was likely to worke vpon Hotham

at that time obſtinate, but it was a neceſſitie vpon his Majeſt: to endeavour, that he ſhould be proceeded againſt injuſtice.

There hath not been obſerved in the King a ſorrow for his owne ſins, nor for ſuch ſins of others, as cannot be ſuppoſed a direct injury to himſelfe. This man will not have the Kings ſorrow for his ſins obſerved, nor acknowledged, wee have ſeene his malicious detractions of the Kings ſorrow for his conſent to the death of the Earle of Strafford, and it cannot be expected from ſuch men, that they will give Teſtimony to any truth, that deny all evidence of it.

The Kings labour to have the ſinner only puniſhed wilbe called revenge. And why? They pretended juſtice, not revenge that after cut of Sr. John Hothams head. May not a King doe juſtice without revenge? The injuſtice in abettinge, & protecting Sr. John Hotham at that time was the ground worke of the ſucceeding evills, and the ſame men, that denyed juſtice at his Maj: deſire tooke reveng of the ſame inſolencie afterward.

Hull was not the Kings owne towne, but the Kingdomes. And how became they a Towne, have they not all their liberties, and graunts from the King? He might have ſaid that Townes vnder a popular Government were the peoples, but in a Kingdome, it is a fantaſticall dreame, & the lawes deny a poſſibilitie of any ſuch propertie having placed the ſoveraigntie of the Kingdome in the King, & ſuch a concluſion of right is inconſiſtent with a kingdome.

The Armes he ſayes *were publique Armes bought with publique money, or not his owne.* If the king have money from the publique may they take it away againe, to what end then doe they give him ſubſidies, if the money be ſtil their owne, and they may take away what is bought with it.

Had they been his owne, as much as the private houſe, and Armes of any man are his owne the law permitts not to vſe them in away not private, but ſuſpitious to the Commonwealth. If vulgar ſuſpition may checke publique imployment, he may not looke long to vſe any thing. And is it a cryme in the kinge to vſe his private wealth in a publique warr? No doubt, but his Majeſt: propertie is asmuch, as any private mans, els his kingly office had little honour, or ſtrength, and he is not accountable for the vſe, which he makes of his Eſtate either private, or publique, and there was noe feare of the vſe, that the king would make, but from Traytours, that would prevent his defence.

The King by his overtalking ſeemes to doubt of beleife touching his patience at Hull. He expected not, nor valued the beleife of Traytours, but ſuch as ſoberly conſider what he ſayes, will not judge him over talking, but modeſtly expreſſing his owne temper, which endured ſoe high a provocation.

The king ſayes *he could not, but obſerve, how God not long after pleaded, and avenged his cauſe.* The Libeller ſayes *moſt men, and commonly the worſt are apt to interpret the judgments of God to the juſtifying of their owne cauſe.*

Its

Its possible the worst men may doe soe, but we see it very frequent with the best. The Prophet David often takes notice of Gods dealing with his Enemies,& wicked men. The Libeller might hence observe his Masters, the worst of men, that interpret, and expound the Judgments of God,and the event of providence to the justifing of their Rebellion how often hath he in this Libell taken vp that Argument, and in this very Chapter makes an observation of Gods Judgment vpon the King,from their murther of him before his owne Pallace gate. And how frequent are their successes produced as profes of the goodnes of their cause,but his Majest:observation is not grounded vpon the event, but the evident Cryme of Hotham, which all men held Treason, but such,as would allow nothing to be Treason against the King. Although we know not the reasons of Gods ptoceedings, who often leaves good men to suffer, and wicked men prosper, yet when we see the prime instrument of a wicked designe perish by the hands of those, whome he served in his vnlawfull enterprize, we may justly take notice of the proportion betweene the sin, and the punishment.

His comparing Sauls conjecture of *an advantage God had sent him in Davids being at Keilah, hath noe* resemblance to the taking away of Hothams life, Saul being not only deceived in the advantage, but conscious of Gods disfavour.

Hotham was safe,and successefull,while he continued true to the Parliament. But the guilt of his conscience made him vnquiet.

If God had purposed such an end for his opposition to the King,he would not have deferred to punish him till of an Enemy he was made the Kings friend, nor have made his repentance the occasion of his ruine. These presumptuous Rebells dare sit in judgment vpon Gods wayes,and prescribe a rule for his proceedings. Its true, becaus judgment is not executed speedily, the hearts of the children of men are set vpon evill, & the Libeller judges, that if the judgments of God be not apparent in his time,that is foorth with, they are none at all. God brought his judgment vpon the son of Ahab, and not vpon himselfe, because he humbled himselfe, and God punisht the sins of David vpon his posteritie, though he forgave him, and we may conceive the judgment of God vpon a wicked Act, not the repentance of it, though it come after in time. Strafford Duke of Buckingham was an active assistant to Rich: the 3: in his vsurpation, and after revolting from him perisht by that power he had raysed, which all men looke on as a judgment vpon his first compliance with that Tyrant, and the fate of Hotham, and that Duke hold greate proportion in regard of their Actions, and sufferings.

Glorious deedes done to ambitious ends finde a reward sutable. And that the Libeller might justly apply vnto Sr. Iohn Hotham,who made popular applause the end of his Treason,and perisht by popular fury.

Mē may heere take notice what thākes he had from the king for revolting to his

cauſe. Repenting Traytours may have mercy, but they deſerve not thankes, & though his puniſhment may be remitted, the infamy of his Act will ſurvive.

Becauſe *God judges not by humane fancie*, therefore ſayes he *ſuch events, as are obvious to every fancie, are moſt like to be erroneous.* And then ſuch Acts of providence, as make men ſay ſurely there is a God, that judgeth the earth are moſt likely to be miſtaken. Although Common fancies are likely to be deceived, it is a ſorry inference from thence, that what is obvious to every fancie weake, and wiſe, ſhould be more likely to be erroneous.

The king ſoe farr pittied Hotham, as *he thought he at firſt acted more againſt the light of his conſcience, then many other men, in the ſame cauſe.* To this the Libeller ſayes. *They who act againſt conſcience are leaſt of all to be pittied either at the Barr of humane, or divine Iuſtice.* Deſperate ſinners, as moſt miſerable, are moſt to be pittied in Chriſtian Charitie, though juſtice proceede more ſeverely againſt them, pitties are part of juſtice, the Libeller is acquainted only with the operations of malice, not of pittie, whereof his whole diſcourſe ſhewes him deſtitute, otherwiſe the kings pittie could not argue him *deſtitute of the Common grounds of nature*, as the Libeller inferrs, and ſhewes that he eſteemes the common grounds of nature, Acts of Tyrany, and inſultation vpon others, ruine, hatred, and ſcorne being all the Charitie, that Sectaries practiſe.

He ſayes *the king jerkes at ſome mens reforming to modells of Religion, and that they thinke, all is gold of pietie, that doth but gliſter with a ſhew of zeale.* To this ſayes the Libeller. *The pietie of his Prelacie modell, gliſtered more vpon the poſts, and pillars, which their Zeale, and fervencie guilded over, then in true workes of ſpirituall edification.* The repairing, and beautifying of the houſes of God was the higheſt commendation of many of his faithfull Servants, and the Scripture gives that for the high commendation of the famous Jehojada, and we may expect ſpirituall edification from thoſe, whoſe zeale, & fervencie carries them to beſtow their goods on ſuch Actions, nothing but deſtruction of Church, & pietie from thoſe, that decry ſuch commendable, and neceſſary workes, & we have found, that ſuch men, as have pretended to ſpirituall edification, by traducing other mens zeale in the outward ſervice of God, have proved at laſt rotten Carkaſſes guilded over, and painted ſepulchers.

He is ſorry, *that Hotham felt the Iuſtice of others, and fell not rather in to the hands of his mercy.* The libeller ſayes *he ſhould have ſhewed, what mercie he had vſed to ſuch as fell into his hands.* He needed not ſhew that, whereof there are ſoe many Examples.

But ſayes the Libeller, *whathever one man might have expected, the whole nation found none, but had been ſwallowed vp in blood, had not his power failed.* What neede the King produce Examples of his mercy, when his moſt malicious Enemies offred nothing to the contrary, but the warr, which they

they had neceſſitated him to make. There cannot be an Argument more convincing of the want of all juſtification in theſe Rebells, then their perpetuall recourſe to an incredible aſſertion, that the King cauſed the warr, which beſides the falſenes of the allegation is not of weight to argue want of mercy, when as Princes, and ſtates may caſually be engaged in a warr, and yet be farr from crueltie, or deſignes of revenge, and his Majeſt: knowne backwardnes to a warr, and moderation in it, ſhew his compaſſion as eminent to the publique, as particular perſons.

The King ſayes *Clemencie is a debt, which he ought to pay to thoſe, that crave it, ſince we pay not any thing to God for his mercies, but prayers, & prayſes.* This ſayes the Libeller *hath ſound of gravitie, but the ſignificance of nothing pertinent.* And yet it ſignifies, that we are to forgive others, becauſe God forgives vs. But ſayes the Libeller *we ought by this reaſon as freely to pay all things to all men.* Wee ought noe doubt freely to pay what is due to all men, but the Scripture more particularly requires Clemencie, and forgivenes from vs in regard our ſelves have moſt neede of it from God, and the Libeller ſhewes a greate emptines of reaſon, that calls this an *emptie ſentence*, and vpon this occaſion to repeate the payment of *the kings dutie to the kingdome*, when as he declares, that nothing, but the giving vp of his Crowne could be a diſcharge of his dutie, ſoe grave a judge is he of *debts, and duties.*

The King pitties Hotham, but aggravates rather then leſſens, or concealos his fault. Conceale, or leſſen it, he could not, aggravate he doth not, & being a King his pittie ought not to deſtroy his judgment, nor deceive him in the offence of thoſe he pardons.

If *a reiterating judge be worſe then a Tormenter*, a reiterating ſlanderer deſerves Torment. The mention of a malefactours offence, or repetition of a publique tranſgreſſion is farr from a Triumph, and as this Act of Hotham was a groundworke of infinite miſerie: ſoe his Majeſt: deepe ſenſe of the miſcheife of that fact, might reflect on it with ſerious obſervation, and pittie without any Triumph.

He is angry that the king ſayes *after times will diſpute, whether Hotham were more infamous at Hull, or at Tower hill.* And ſayes *what knew he of after times, and while he ſits judging the fate of that vnhappy father, and ſon, knew not, that the like attended him before his owne Pallace gate, and as litle knew, whether after times doe not reſerve a greater infamy to the ſtory of his life, and Raigne.* The libeller well knew by the booke he ſeekes to anſweare, that his Majeſt: well knew the power, & malice of his Enemies, while he wrote this, and that he expected they would ſhew their vtmoſt crueltie to his honour, aſwell, as his life, but he was well aſſured their injuſtice, & diſloyaltie could not effect what their impietie deſigned, and as long as Religion, or reaſon inhabite the world, his ſtory cannot be blotted in after times, but it ſeemes the libeller is apprehenſive of future infamy, though he thinke himſelfe aſſured of preſent power.

He

He would ſeeme an Enemy *to vaine repetitions in prayers*, but its only of ſuch things, as Traytours will not pray for, otherwiſe there is large experience of the vaine babling of ſectaries in their prayers.

He ſayes *its too preſumptious in a written, and publiſhed prayer to take it as a favour from God before he knew it was intended him.* He knew God had brought a ſevere puniſhment vpon a knowne offence, and how could this be preſumption to mention it, in a publiſhed prayer, but how can the libeller call it *the ſacrifie named by Eccleſiaſtes*, that practiſes ſuch particular thankesgivings for ſucceſſes, when as the cauſe he maintaines, and proſecutes is ſoe notoriouſly wicked.

The King ſayes *Let not thy Iuſtice prevent the objects, and opportunities of my mercy* The Libeller ſayes. *To folly, or Blaſphemy, or both ſhall wee impute this, ſhall the Iuſtice of God give place, & ſerve the mercies of a man? all other men, who know what they aſke deſire of God, that their doings may tend to his glory.* And doth not he, that prayes he may be able to ſhew mercy to his Enemies, pray, that his Actions may tend to Gods glory, Is not God glorified in the mercies of men? Is not mercy in men a guift of God, and can this triſler pretend ſin in that prayer? which deſires of God, that his Juſtice may not prevent their mercie to their Enemies, May not men pray for their Enemies, pray to have judgments diverted from them, pray to have an occaſion to ſhew them mercy? But this libeller, that eſteemes ſoe litle to Blaſpheame is careles how falſely he charge it on others.

Vpon the liſting,

AND

RAYSING ARMIES.

HE begins with the Kings mention of Tumults, *the demonſtrations* he calls them *of the peoples love, & loyaltie to the Parliament.* Which in their nature more then the kings denomination were demonſtrations of diſobedience to law, hatred of Government, & diſloyaltie to the king. Their petitioning was in the Authors owne judgment the height of violence, & Barbariſme, which he compares

pares to the Iron flaile,& thoſe Armes which he cals defenſive were ſo apparently a Trayterous hiſtolitie, that the ends, which he aſſignes for them admit not the leaſt colour for the appellation of defenſive.

The King takes noe notice, that thoſe liſted about him were the beginners of theſe Tumults. Neither could he of ſoe ſtrange an imagination.

The king ſayes *his receſſe gave them confidence, that he might be conquered.* The Libeller ſayes, *other men ſuppoſed both that, and all things els, who knew him neither by nature warlike, nor experienced, nor fortunate, yet ſuch* ſayes he *are readieſt to imbroyle others.* How well he performes the firſt period of his booke not to deſcant on the kings misfortunes his readers may heere ſee, that makes the kings misfortune his reproach, and a ground of their wicked confidence to Rebell againſt him, but that ſuch men are readieſt to imbroyle others is not ſoe certaine, but vndoubted they are not readieſt to imbroyle themſelves, and noe valour, nor experience, whereof his Majeſt: is wel knowne to have had a greate meaſure can ſtopp a ſlandrous tongue. The miſcheifes brought vpon his Majeſt: kingdomes ſprung from ſuch perſons, as ſought their advantage by ſuch broyles, which all men ſee the King could never expect.

The King ſayes *he had a ſoule invincible.* And the Libeller ſayes, *what prayſe is that? the vnteachable man hath a ſoule to all reaſon invincible.* And is an invincible courage noe prayſe? He ſeekes to ſhew his witt by applying invincible to vnteachable, when as if he had cited the Kings next words, as he ought, he had loſt his jeſt, for the King ſayes, he *had a ſoule invincible through Gods grace enabling him,* but he breaketh ſentences, and truth, leaſt he ſhould breake for want of matter.

That the King labours *to have it thought, that his fearing God more then man was the ground of his ſufferings.* The Libeller ſayes, *he pretended to feare God more then the Parliament, who never vrged him to doe otherwiſe.* And did they not vrge him to doe otherwiſe, when they vrged him to doe that, which was againſt his conſcience? But there neede not more be ſpoken of this, for the Libeller calls that a narrow conſcience, which will not follow a multitude againſt its owne perſwaſion.

He ſhewes his levitie beyound that Creature he calls the vulgar, who now affirmes the King was *drawne by his Courtiers, and Biſhopps,* and yet in the beginning of his booke he ſayes, that *the diſcourſes, and preachings of Courtiers, and Prelates againſt the Parliament was but a Copy taken from his owne words, and Actions, that all remiſſenes in Religion iſſued originally from his owne authoritie, all miſcarriages in ſtate may be imputed to noe other perſon cheifely then to himſelfe.*

He goes on to compare the words of *Saul, that he had performed the Commaundement of God to the Kings mention of his fearing God, & the kings vpholding the Prelates, againſt the advice of the Parliament, & example of al reformations, is not much vnlike, if not much worſe,* noe neerer like, then this Authors writings to modeſtie, & loyaltie. Is the advice of the Parliament,

and the example of all reformations equall to the expreſſe Commaund of God? The examples of all Reformations, himſelfe tells afterward are not concurrent in the matter he mentions, and if they were ſoe, are all points of reformation equally neceſſary, and of the ſame obligation with the commaund of God? and was the Reformation of the Church of England noe reformation? Why then doth he ſay all Reformation? And is not the Church of England equall, if not ſuperiour to any part of the world, that hath reformed? But we ſee what account theſe hipocrites make of the Example of all Reformation, that have ſet vp ſchiſmaticall confuſions of Religion in contempt of all Reformation. His Majeſt: did noe more in vpholding the Prelates, then what the example of the moſt primitive times, Godly Emperours, & holy martyrs inſtructed him in, which noe Reformation ever contradicted, and he had no reaſon to hearken to the advice of ſuch, as then called themſelves a Parliament, who had broken all the lawes, and priviledges of Parliament, expelled the members, and were governed by Tumults, & a company of Bedlam Sectaries againſt the doctrine, and practice of the vinverſall Church. The practice of Saul in perſecuting David wel ſutes with the courſe of theſe Rebells, but they have gone beyound him in malice, and diſobedience in the matter both of David, and alſoe the Amalekites, he brake the Commaundement of God in ſparing Amaleke, theſe traytours preſumptuouſly breake the Commaund of God in deſtroying their King, & Church. And this man exceedes Sauls preſumption, that makes the preſervation of an order continued in the Church in all ages as bad, or worſe, then the ſin of Saul.

He ſayes *acts of grace are proud, vnſelfe knowing words in the mouth of any King, who affects not to be a God.* Certainly this Libellers words ſhew him not only in affection, but in Act a proud vnſelfe knowing man. Are there noe Acts of favour, noe Acts of mercy in Kings, but all of neceſſitie, but enough hath been ſaid to theſe braineſicke dreames.

Never King was leſſe in danger of violence from his ſubjects, till he vnſheathed his ſword, nay long after, when he had ſpilt the blood of thouſands, they had ſtill his perſon in a fooliſh veneratiõ. Should a Chriſtian cal that, which God Commaunded, & David practiſed fooliſh veneration, but they whoſe wiſedome is Rebellion, hold Divine wiſedome fooliſhnes. And was he in ſo litle danger from thoſe, that held that veneration fooliſh, were there none, that held ſoe, when they affronted him, and threatned him every day? To what end ſhould multitudes come about his Pallace, and cry Juſtice, when they ſought murder? What would they have done if he had denyed their demaunds, ſhall we beleive they intended noe violence, or ſhall wee beleive, that they, who had ſeiſed the forts, and navy, and vſurpt the Government would have vſed noe violence to his perſon, when they had him, if he plyed not with them? Its true many were not wholy vnſhamed at the firſt, but the malice, and ambition

of

of others was ſufficiently confirmed, and the multitude eaſily falls by Example.

The King complaines, *that Civill warr muſt be the fruites of his ſeventeene yeares raigning with ſuch a meaſure of Iuſtice, peace plentie, and Religion, as all nations either admired or envyed.* The Libeller ſayes *for Iuſtice let the Councell table, ſtarr Chamber, and high Commiſſion ſpeake the prayſe of it.* Wee may be aſſured that malefactours will never prayſe Court of juſtice, we know Sectaries, and ſeducers hated the high Commiſſion, and ſeditious Libellers the ſtarr chamber, & conſpiratours, & incendiaries the councells of Kings, and there were noe Acts paſt in theſe places of ſuch exception, as the meaſure of juſtice, which he enjoyed was not admired, or envyed by all nations.

His mention of *aboliſhing Parliaments* detracts not from the meaſure of juſtice, peace, plentie, and Religion, & we have found what injuſtice hath ſucceeded.

The diſplacing of honeſt Iudges he hath miſplaced to detract from the juſtice of his Majeſt: Goverment, and as the placing of judges was in his Majeſt: choiſe, ſoe he might take notice, whether their places might not be better ſupplyed by others, and the change of two judges, for thats the number in ſeventeene yeares, is beneath an exception, his rayling declamation againſt corrupt Government being only in generall deſerves not an anſweare, and the knowne proſperitie, peace, and plentie of the Kingdome, are a ſufficient confutation of ſuch imaginary oppreſſions.

He ſayes *what peace was that, which drew out the Engliſh to a needeles, and diſhonourable voyage againſt the ſpaniards at Cades.* It was that peace the Parliament deſired, and if the voyage proved ſucceſſeles his Majeſt: by preventing further danger, and preſerving peace notwithſtanding the miſcarriage (which muſt be the diſhonour only of the managers) ſufficiently teſtifies how wel he deſerved of his people for the continuance of their peace, and ſafetie.

He askes next *what that was, which lent our ſhipping to a Treacherous, and Antichriſtian warr againſt the poore Proteſtants of Rochell.* What is this againſt our peace at home, and though there were ſhipps of ours vſed againſt Rochel, tis ſufficiently knowne they were not lent againſt Rochell, and the Dutch ſhipps, which were vſed, as ours were not lent to a Treacherous, and Antichriſtian warr.

He askes *what peace was that, which fell to robb the french by ſea to the imbarring all our marchants in that Kingdome.* Is not this man madd, that will charge the vſe of the ſhipping againſt Rochell for a Cryme, and call it a Treacherous, and Antichriſtian warr, and preſently charge the King for making warr againſt the french, vpon the ground of vſing his ſhipps againſt Rochell, and call it a robbing of the french by ſea, and is it poſſible to avoyde the loſſe of Marchants in caſe of hoſtilitie?

He proceedes to cry out *on that vnbleſt expedition to the Iſle of Ree doubtfull whether more calamitous in the ſucces, or deſigne.* Was not the deſigne in the favour of Rochell, did they not deſire it? and yet he calls the ill ſucceſſe of that Action *the betraying all the flower of our military youth, and beſt Commaunders to a ſhamefull ſurpriſall, and execution.* And who betrayed them, and to what purpoſe, what advantage could his Majeſt: have by ſuch a loſſe? And was the warr againſt Rochell Treacherous, and Antichriſtian, and the releife too? But this Libeller is reſolute to defie ſence, and reaſon, & now he hath ſpoken againſt the peace we enjoyed, whereto doth it amount, was there any interruption of our peace at home, and was there not cauſe for theſe expeditions abroade, If there were not the Parliament failed in their Councell to the King in adviſing the warr with ſpaine, and complaining of the french for the miſimployment of the ſhipps againſt Rochell?

If peace were intended vs at home, what meant theſe billetted ſouldiers in all parts of the Kingdome. Dot noth he know the meaning, that mentions Cades, and the Iſle of Ree, where they were imployed, ſurely he is ſoe intent on words, as he looſes his Memory, aſwell as his other faculties.

But he hath found out a deſigne *of German horſe to ſubdue vs in our peacefull houſes.* Theſe German horſe have made much noyſe, & yet were never diſcovered, and the King, who was adviſed to make a warr in Germany, and other places by the Parliament could not vſe German horſe, but againſt England. But what is all this to the greate meaſure of peace we enjoyed above other nations. Can any man, that reades this Libellers willfull impertinency judge other, then that he fights blindfold, who would extend theſe forraigne voyages, which had not the face of warr at home, and continved not beyound the fower firſt yeares of his Majeſt: Raigne, to diminiſh the meaſure of our peace ſoe long enjoyed, and that in the middeſt of ſoe many miſcarriages, and conſpiracies both at home, and abroade.

For our Religion he ſayes, *where was there a more ignorant, prophane, and vitious Clergie learned only in the antiquitie of their pride.* The pride of theſe Sectaries contemnes all learning, & antiquitie, which condemnes their fantaſticall, & preſumptuous novelezing. The learning of the Engliſh Clergie is too well knowne to the world to receive any diſreput from the Streechinge of night oules, and of Kats.

Noe wiſe man could ſee, what was left for other nations to admire or envie, but to pittie. Other nations ſaw who had enough to cauſe them to admire our happines, not to pittie our condition, and of this there is a large Teſtimony.

But ſayes the libeller, *wealth, and plentie in a land, where Iuſtice Raignes not is no Argument of a floriſhing ſtate, but of neerenes rather to ruine, & commotion.* The bleſſings of God, peace, and plentie are often turned into wan-

wantonneſſe, and wickednes by the people, and are often a ſigne by the peoples abuſe of enſuing ruine, or commotion, and of this the preſent condition of England is a greate Teſtimonie, but it was never denyed, to be the floriſhing ſtate of any nation, and he will finde litle credit to his ſuppoſition, that Juſtice Raignes not, where there is wealth, and plentie in a land.

There were not ſome miſcarriages only of Government, which might eſcape. And of that nature are all the particulars gathred by him, if they had been true, *but an viniverſall diſtemper, and reducement to arbitrary Government.* There was a diſtemper, and diſaffection to Government in many ſeditious ſeducers, but an viniverſall diſtemper, and reducement to Arbitrary Government could not conſiſt with the oppreſſion of that tranquillitie, and ſecuritie of the people, which was viſible to all men, the loſſe whereof brought on by theſe Rebells is too late lamemted.

That his Majeeſt: owned the Actions, and protected the perſons of men in higheſt favour with him is noe argument of this vinverſall diſtemper, no more then the vulgar cryes againſt rulers is an Argument of their miſcarriage, or the peoples moderation, who will have perſons removed from Government, and yet not agree, who ſhall ſucceede them. It was an Argument of greate diſtemper in a people, that cryed out againſt the Kings evill Councellours, that could not judge of their Actions, but of noe vinverſall diſtemper in the Government, neither could the king with pietie, & juſtice leave his Miniſters to the malice of conſpiratours and barbaritie of Tumults.

The king ſayes, *whoſe innocent blood hath he ſhedd, what widdowes, or orphans teares can wittnes againſt him?* The Libeller thinkes he hath given an anſweare by ſaying *the ſuſpected poyſonnig of his Father not enquired into, and he advanced, who was aceuſed by Parliament to be Author of the fact, and many yeares of cruell warr on his people in three Kingdomes.* It is a wonder to amazement, that ſuch, whoſe language hath noe Limits of truth, or modeſtie ſhould not be able to forge a probable Calumnie, the Records of the Parliament ſhew, that noe man was accuſed for the poyſoninge of the kings Father, nor poyſoninge named, & the fact was fully enquired into, and all wittneſſes examined, that had any knowledge of Circumſtances touching it, and muſt this be the particular to prove the king guiltie, of ſhedding blood? We may ſee vpon what grounds they will draw blood, that offer ſuch pretences for taking the blood of their king. Is it poſſible, that a Tyrant in ſeventeene yeares Raigne could not be proved guiltie of the blood of one man? And can a Rebellion be more apparently convinced, then by the ſeeking a cauſe for it from the reſiſtance, that is made againſt it, and the endeavour to ſuppreſſe it? Was ever a cauſe ſoe barren of excuſe, that had nothing, but its owne guilt for defence?

But he hath found out *a ſcotchman, not vnacquainted* he ſayes *with*

the affaires, who affirmes, that there hath been more Christian blood shed by the Commission, approbation, and connivance of King Charles, and his Father Iames, in the latter end of their Raigne, then in the ten Roman Persecutions. And is not this a doughtie authoritie, what could he say more to prove himselfe a false varlett? Whoever saw, or heard of this shedding of Christian blood, is it possible, that soe much blood should be shed, and noe man know it, but this Scotchman? Was all the world soe negligent to take notice of it, and did the Scotchman, and this Author thinke, that the blood of the late warr made vp this number, they may then expect vengeance vpon themselves, and their bloody crew for it, either heere, or heereafter. They value such, as suffred in the ten persecutions at the same rate they doe their King, and their conscience, and if they thought persecution odious, why doe they exercise a persecution vppon Christians as cruell, as these persecuting Emperours?

He sayes *not to speake of those many whippings, and other corporall inflictions, wherewith his Raigne also before this warr was not vnbloody.* And is a Raigne bloody by inflicting death vpon robbers, and murtherers, or whipping, and the Pillory vpon, Cheates Infamous Libellers, and seditious disturbers of Government, but of these latter the number was very small not exceeding fower in seventeene yeares, and these merited the punishment they had, & an higher had not exceeded their crymes. Is the execution of law a bloody Raigne, he findes none, that suffred *banishment*, nor any that died *in prison*, but such as were restrained by ordinary Justice.

He cannot pretend *an arbitrary power* in any of this, that *the King infested the true Church* is noe other language, then what good Princes allwayes received from Sectaries, who accuse allwayes for their restraint, infesting the true Church, but all men now see they are the malignant Compamy that infest the true Church, & the seducers of simple soules.

But he hath a proofe of blood above exception, where no blood was drawne, and that is *the six members, whome all men judged to have escaped no lesse then Capitall danger.* Doubtles they had merited Capitall punishment in the judgment of all knowing men. That a just King may be offended for the escape of malefactours is easily beleived, but that saying *the birds are flowne* argues much trouble is a secret to all men, and a proverbe as often applyed in jest, as earnest.

The libeller sayes, *that if some vulter in the mountaines could have spake, he could not have vttered fitter words at the losse of his prey.* The excesses in blood, and crueltie of theis Rebells cannot be expressed to the full, by the savage nature of any Creature. The grinning of doggs howling of wolves, and hissing of Serpents are not more hideous to nature, then the petulence of vile persons against kings are abominable to Religion, and pietie.

Because Nero was vnwilling to sett his hand to the execution of a Com-

Common Malefactour, and *wiſhing he had not knowne letters* he would prove the King proſecuting Traytours to have noe greate averſation to blood, but it ſtrongly proves a bloody conſpiracie, when the contrivers are held innocent, and the King made the offender for ſeeking juſt puniſhment, and the Triumphs of ſuch, as protected thoſe perſons, and their impudent braving the King at his very doores argued their haſte to the ſhedding of that blood, which ſince hath covered the Land.

Touching the cauſe of the warr, the King ſayes, *It was not my withdrawing from whitehall, for noe account in reaſon could be given of thoſe Tumults, where an orderly guard was graunted.* The libeller ſayes, *that if it be a moſt certaine truth, that the Parliament could never obtaine any guard fit to be confided in, then ſome account of theſe pretended Tumults may in reaſon be given.* But if they be not only pretended, but apparently Tumults, there can be noe account given of them, at leaſt the libeller vndertakes it not, and that they could not obtaine a guard fit to be confided in, is falſe, for they had a guard, and Commaunder of their owne nomination, though not the Earle of Eſſex.

The King aſkes, *whome did he protect againſt the Iuſtice of Parliament.* The Libeller ſayes *he endeavoured to reſcue Strafford*, that was from their injuſtice, if he had done ſoe.

But ſayes the Libeller he endeavoured it, though *with the deſtruction of them, and the Cittie, commaunding admittance of new ſouldiers into the Tower.* And is it a neceſſary conſequent, that the admittance of new ſouldiers into the Tower were to the *deſtruction of Parliament, and Citie.* But did not ſuch, as like blood hounds, & wolves hunted the Earle of Strafford, that they might not looſe their prey, and the ſweetenes of their revenge in drinking his blood, ſtirr vp the Tumults to the deſtruction of King, Parliament, and Kingdome?

What can be diſputed with ſuch a King, in whoſe mouth, & opinion the Parliament it ſelfe was never but a faction, and their Iuſtice noe Iuſtice, but the Dictates, and overſwaying inſolence of Tumults, and rabbles. The Parliament was never a faction in the Kings mouth, but it is in every mans mouth, that the Parliament hath been overſwayed by a faction, and a faction have called themſelves the Parliament. And how can the Libeller define a Parliament, but he muſt acknowledge that thoſe, whome the King calls a faction were noe Parliament, and that their Actions were noe Juſtice, but the Dictates, and overſwaying inſolence of Tumults, and rabbles? himſelfe prooves it by the commendation he gives the Tumults, for effecting theſe Acts, which he now calls the Juſtice of the Parliament, & noe wiſe man could thinke ſuch a rabble fit to Judge of Delinquents, or that ſuch men, who fled from their fury were thereby culpable of the Crymes objected, and the faireſt Tryall would ſooner have condemned to death, theſe Tumultuous accuſers then the parties accuſed. But who can talke with ſuch a man, as this breaker, that reputes Monarchy

narchy Tyrany, order in the Church an impoſed Religion, and lawes worſe then Ceremonies in Religion.

He compares *the avoyding of his madd Iudicature to Catilnies flight, and excepting to the Roman Senate, and Ceſars injecting ſcrupulous demurrs againſt the Decres of the ſenate vpon Lentulus, and Cethegus.* But did either of them object, that the power of Tumults overſwayed the ſenate, or that the ſenate wanted freedome, and had oppreſſed the members of it? If Catiline had ſet vp a ſenate as Cæſar did afterward, and theſe Rebells have in England, & oppreſſed the legal Government, the exceptions had been very juſt, but exceptions againſt particular ſenatours for private animoſities cannot derogate from the judgment of the whole being free.

That *ſuch reaſons were vrged for Strafford*, was never heard at his Tryall, or other proceedings againſt him, the caſes being contrary, for Lentulus, and the reſt were accuſed for conſpiring againſt the ſtate, & Strafford was accuſed by thoſe, that conſpired againſt the ſtate, and ſought to take him away for a cleerer paſſage to their deſigne.

The King vouchſafes, to the Reformation, which both Kingdomes intended noe better name then innovation, and ruine both to Church, and ſtate, and the expelling of Biſhopps out of the Church, ruine to the Church, and out of the houſe of Peeres ruine to the ſtate. And he aſkes *how happy the nation could be in ſuch a governour, who counted that their ruine, which they thought their deliverance.* It cannot be doubted, but the abolition of the order, and Government of Church and ſtate, is an innovation, & performed by force againſt the King, execrable Rebellion, and the King never doubted to ſay, that ſuch diſorderly innovations were the ruine of Church, and ſtate, and the innovations, and ruines mentioned by the King to be agitated by ſome men are not reſtrained to the cauſe of the Biſhopps, though that alone, and the manner of proceeding in regard of the injuſtice, violence, and the dangerous conſequences, that attend it, threatned ruine to Church, and ſtate. It is ſtrange, that a people may miſtake their ruine for their deliverance, & that a wiſe Prince by denying them their wil may keepe them from periſhing, which their owne errours would caſt them into, but ſuch, as knew how ſmall a part of the people, & how contemptible, affected thoſe innovations, and how they were cheriſht by the leaders of Rebellion to ſtrengthen their partie, and how others were drawne in by hopes, and feares, to comply with a potent faction for their profit, or ſafetie, and how greate a partie both for number, & qualitie deteſted theſe innovations may well conclude that neither the nation thought it their deliverance, nor the Kings refuſall other, then a juſt care, and providence for their good.

It is not likely, that the houſe of Peeres gave hardly their conſent to the Bills againſt the Biſhopps, that ſoe eaſily gave it to attach them of high Treaſon. But it is apparent they hardly gave their conſent to thoſe Bills, for they had often rejected them, and therefore his preſumption is of noe weight againſt plaine proofe.

If

If their rights, and priviledges were thought ſo vndoubted in that houſe, then was that proteſtation noe Treaſon, and the houſe will become liable to a juſt conſtruction either of injuſtice for ſoe conſenting, or of vſurpation to expect, that their voting, or not voting ſhould obſtruct the Commons. The priviledges of the Biſhopps had they not been vndoubted, they needed not, an Act of Parliament, nor ſoe many Acts of violence to take them away, neither can the Commons pretend to greater right for their ſitting in the one houſe, then the Biſhopps in the other, and the Libeller hath rightly concluded, that their proteſtation was noe Treaſon, but that their accuſation by the houſe of Commons was a falſe, and vngrounded Clamour, and their commitment by the Lords houſe an odious injuſtice, but it could be noe vſurpation to expect, that their voting, or not voting was concluſive to the Commons. To what end did the Commons offer their accuſation to the Lords, if their voting, or not voting were not conſiderable. Is it Juſtice, when they concurre, & vſurpation when they diſſent? But Lords houſe, & Commons houſe are vſurpers, when they obſtruct the Dictates, and overſwaying inſolence of rabbles, and Tumults.

The Commons were not to deſiſt for five repulſes of the Lords, noe not for fiftie from what in the name of the Kingdome they had demaunded, ſoe long as thoſe Lords were none of our Lords, and what if they had been your Lords, were they then to deſiſt, if ſo, it was more then they would doe to their King, but our, or not our makes noe difference to reſolute Traytours. The Lords were ſoe farr their Lords, as they were not to perſiſt by the power, wherewith they were intruſted for the kingdome in their demaund after the Lords refuſall, for to what end hath the law ordained a Lords houſe, and the Commons ſoe long practiſed their addreſſes to them, if they may doe what they pleaſe without them? Doth the vſe of the name of the kingdome add any right to them, that have not the power of the kingdome, and demaund things to the deſtruction of the kingdome? The king allowes not ſuch a faction the name of a Parliament, which hath nothing of either houſe, but ſome members, that aſſume the name without the priviledges, and authoritie, that conſtituted it.

Though the Bill againſt roote, and branch paſſed not till many of the Lords with ſome few of the Commons, either enticed away by the king, or overawed by the ſenſe of their owne malignitie deſerted the Parliament, that was noe warrant for them, who remained being farr the greater number to lay aſide the Bill. He well knowes they, that remained of the Lords houſe were an inconſiderable number, and ſuch, as deſerted the Commons houſe wanted not many of the number of them, that remained, and of them, that remained many were overawad by force, and diverſe plainely diſſented to that Bill. The injuſtice of them, that remained was intolerable that refuſed all reparation, or ſecuritie to ſuch, as were

injured by the Tumults, and it was a moſt perfidious Act in them to enforce their members to deſert the houſe, that they might exerciſe their Arbitrary power over the kingdome, the injury was ſo apparent, & the pretẽce of malignancie ſo ridiculous againſt the deſerting members, that noe ſober man can imagnie enticement, or overawing to be the cauſe of their withdrawing, and theſe remaining members ought to have forborne by their dutie to the kingdome, the paſſing of ſuch a Bil in the abſence of ſoe many members, but they, that will forbeare noe degree of treaſon cannot probably abſtaine from breakes of priviledge, and leſſe injuries.

He ſayes *this degrading of the Biſhopps was orthodoxall in the Church ancient, and reformed.* What will not this man ſay? Wee neede not wonder at his other impudencies, that will affirme the taking away the order of Biſhopps orthodoxall in the ancient Church, which never wanted them.

The King ſayes *he was bound beſides his judgment by a moſt ſtrict, and vndiſpenſable oath to preſerve that order, and the rights of the Church.* And ſayes the Libeller. *If the letter of that oath be not interpreted by equitie, reformation, or better knowledge, then was the King bound to graunt the Clergie all priviledges graunted to them by Edward the Confeſſour, and ſo bring in Popery.* Equitie muſt be admitted in all interpretations of oaths, and ſoe muſt better knowledges, but the knowledge of other men is noe expoſition to him, that takes an oath, if his owne knowledge be not convinced. The King hath ſworne to preſerve the priviledges of the Church, to be a protectour of the Biſhopps, and by what equitie, reformation, or better knowledge would this libeller induce the King to breake this oath? If Sectaries ſay the calling is vnlawful againſt the judgment of the vniverſall Church, muſt the king beleive this, & thinke himſelfe abſolved of his oath? The King never doubted, that his oath could not binde him to ſin, but he was aſſured, that it was a ſin to breake his oath, when it was no ſin to keepe it, and while his conſcience was not informed of any vnlawfulnes in the matter of his oath, his ſin muſt be the more hainous to act againſt his oath, aſwell as his knowledge.

The Libeller talkes *of lawes of God, and truth of the Goſpell.* But his ſchiſmaticall fancies muſt over rule lawes, and oath, & though *the German Emperours, or other Kings had noe cauſe to leavy warrs vpon Proteſtant ſubjects vnder colour of a blinde, and literall obſervance to an oath,* it had been a wickednes in their ſubjects to make a warr on them to compell them to breake that oath.

It is not to be imagined, if what ſhalbe eſtabliſhed come in queſtion, but that the Parliament ſhould overſway the King, and not the King the Parliament. Neither can it be imagined that he, which is to be overſwayed by the Parliament is a King.

By all law, and reaſon, that which the Parliament will not, is noe more eſtabliſhed

bliſhed in this Kingdome, neither is the king bound to vphold it, as a thing eſtabliſhed. Certainly lawes are very vainely ſaid to be made by the King, if he have no voyce in the making of them, and if they may be vneſtabliſhed without him, and it was a wickednes, aſwell, as weakenes to binde him to vphold lawes, and to governe his people juſtly, that had not ſoe much as voyce in the making of their lawes, & that was bound to governe by wicked lawes, if the Parliament would have them, ſuch Imaginary powers cannot conſiſt with Religion, law, nor reaſon in the Government of England.

The King ſayes *had he gratified, he thinkes, their Antiepiſconall faction with his conſent, and ſacrifiſed the Church Government, and Revenues to the fury of their Covetuouſnes, they would then have found noe colourable neceſſitie of rayſing an Army.* The Libeller to this ſayes. *It was the fury of his owne hatred to the profeſſours of the true Religion, which incited him to perſecute them with the ſword of warr, when whipps pillories, exiles, and impriſonments were not thought ſufficient.* Its certen ſuch a generation of Traytours, as have perſecuted the King with a warr, juſtly merited to be whipt out of all Kingdomes, and while this Libeller frequently ſports at the Kings neceſſities, he is not aſhamed preſently to call the warr voluntary on his part. If the Kings fury incited him to a warr, he would not ſoe often have ſought peace, nor been denyed peace without the ſacrifice of the Church.

But the Libeller ſayes *to colour this warr the King cannot finde wherewith all, but that ſtale pretence of Charles the fifth, and other Popiſh Kings, that the Proteſtants had only an intent to lay hands on the Church Revenues.* The King neede not a colour for making a warr, whereto neceſſitie enforced him. It is apparent, that the ſectaries in England intended to devoure theſe Revenues, and have effected it, and they profeſſe to ſeeke it by the ſword, becauſe they could not have it otherwiſe.

But the Libeller ſayes, *it was never in the thoughts of the Parliament till exhauſted by warr, their neceſſitie ſeized on that for the Commonwealth, which the Luxury of the Prelates had abuſed to Common miſcheife.* They neede not have been exhauſted, if reaſon, Juſtice, or Religion could have contented them. They will make a warr, and robb, and ſteale from other men to maintaine it. Did not their pretended neceſſitie come from their warr to take away Epiſcopacy, and is not the neceſſitie of their owne making to get theſe Revenues? What if goods dedicated to Gods ſervice were abuſed to luxury, were there none els in the Kingdome ſoe abuſed? Muſt they make choiſe of the Patrimony of the Church for a ſacrifice to their Covetuouſnes, that they may ſpare their private?

That *the King conſented to the vnlording of Biſhopps at Canterbury the cheife ſeate of their pride, for God would have it ſoe.* And can he tax the King for his alluſions vpon the fate of Hotham, and obſerring the courſe

of Gods judgments, and himſelfe make ſuch an obſervation from the Kings paſſing the Bill at Canterbury? May it not be an aggravation of the offence in paſſing the Bill there, rather then a puniſhment vpon thoſe, that were wronged by it, but Canterbury had not relation to their peace in Parliament, but in Church, and therefore his ſcene is miſlayed.

The King ſayes *his conſent to that Bill of putting Biſhopps out of the houſe of Peeres was from his firme perſwaſion of their contentednes to ſuffer a preſent diminution of their rights.* The Libeller from hence argues *the pure mockery of a Royall aſſent to delude for the preſent.* May not ſober times revoke what diſtempered madnes had neceſſitated, and had not the King juſt cauſe to thinke, that after times would ſee the obliquitie of that Bill?

The Libellers conſequence is *that we may hence perceive the wiſedome, and integritie of thoſe votes, which voted his conſeſſions at the Iſle of weight for grounds of a laſting peace.* And why might they not be ſoe, though ſome of them might not be thought fitt to laſt long? And that by the judgment of both King, and houſes? But what were they, that voted, were they not the Libellers Parliament, in whoſe behalfe he hath ſoe often expreſſed his anger for the Kings diſeſteeme of them, and calling them a faction, and now will have neither wiſedome, nor integritie in them?

He ſayes *from the kings profeſſing the continuance of his judgment touching Epiſcopacy, there is a faire juſtification of the Parliament, who notwithſtanding his obſtinate minde omitted not meanes, and patience to have gained him.* They omitted not reproach, and violence, but other meanes, or patience they vſed not, and the Libeller hath contrived a conviction of his Parliament, that their not gaining his conſent to their demaunds was the cauſe of their warr, which he hold juſtified by the Kings continued averſion.

The King ſayes *a greate ſhew of delinquents was made, which were but conſequences of his, and others withdrawing, or defence.* This ſayes the Libeller is *a prettie ſhift to mince the name of a delinquent into a neceſſary conſequent.* It is injuſtice to make the name of delinquent a propertie, and ſnare for innocence. Its plaine, that the faction would have all, that adheared not to them, or left them delinquents, and if ſuch an extenſion be not minced, the law it ſelfe will be, whoſe Rules will not define delinquents, but the obſervation of them become delinquencie.

He ſayes *a Traytour is the conſequent of his Treaſon, and a Rebell of his Rebellion.* And ſuch are certainly delinquents, but for ſaking their ſocietie is not a Cryme to denominate a delinquent, and ſuch only were by the faction called delinquents.

The London Tumults was the Kings overworne Theame, and ſtuffing of all his diſcourſes. Which was not at all mentioned in this place, but tis a

Theame

Theame of difficultie to the Libeller, and wherefore, he would ſtopp the beleife of it by his threed bare repetitions of the blood of the warr, delinquents, Tyrany, and Popery, which are become as vaine, as the taunts of children.

He *turnes to the Scotts, and Covenanters, whome he calls miſobſervers of the Covenant*, and askes *how they will reconcile the preſervation of Religion, &c. With the Kings reſolution, that eſteemes all the Zeale of their proſtituted Covenant noe better then a noyſe, and ſhew of pietie, &c.* For the Covenanters, and miſobſervers of the Covenant we leave to debate their owne controverſies, but noe man knowes what he ſuppoſes, that by thoſe principles *the King might at length come to take the Covenant, and that then all had ended in a happy peace*, which he hates vpon any conditions, but his owne.

He makes an oppoſition betweene *the Kings telling God, that his Enemies are many, and telling the people they are but a faction of ſome few prevayling over his Major part of both houſes.* Might not his Enemies be many, though a faction of a few prevailed over the Major part of both houſes, and wherein *doth the King miſapply David, or David accuſe him?* But the Libeller ſtickes not at miſapplication, nor falſe accuſations.

The King ſayes *he had noe paſſion, deſigne, or preparation to imbroyle his Kingdome in a Civill warr.* The Libeller ſayes, *true*, & yet formerly ſaid, that *his fury incited him to proſecute them with the ſword of warr.* How doth he handle his outworne Theame?

But he gives a reaſon, for *that the King thought his Kingdome to be Iſſachar, that would have couched downe betweene two burthens of Prelaticall ſuperſtition, and Civill Tyrany.* As his Majeſt: ſubjects had peace without burthens, ſoe the reſt of Iſſachar was more eligible, then the blood, and Treacherie of Simeon, and Levi, whoſe rage, and crueltie their Father curſed vpon his death bedd, but ſuch attempts the libeller likes better then Iſſachars eaſe.

He ſayes *the King had made preparation by terrour, and preventive force.* The fury of a warr is come to terrour, and preventive force. Its certaine the Rebells had vſed all meanes to prevent his defence, & his terrour muſt be litle, whoſe force they had ſurpriſed.

The King ſayes *God will finde out bloody, and deceitefull men, many of whome have not lived out halfe their dayes.* The Libeller ſayes, *It behoved him to have been more cautious, how he tempted God til his owne yeares had been further ſpent.* Is it temptation to rely on the truth of Gods word? And may not innocent perſons, whoſe lives are ready to be taken away by blood thirſtie Tyrants reflect vpon Gods word touching wicked mens being cut of, though they ſee their owne life expiring?

The King in his prayer ſayes, *that God knew the cheife deſigne of this warr was either to deſtroy his reaſon, or force his judgment.* The Libeller

ſayes *This is hideous raſhnes accuſing God before men to know that for truth, which all men know to be falſe.* And is it not horrid preſumption in the Libeller to ſay all men know that to be falſe, which himſelfe confeſſes true. And we muſt expect, that the wickednes of theſe Rebels, which accuſe veritie of vntruth will reproach the ſinceritie of his Majeſt: in praying for his Enemies with hipocriſie, their owne corruption excluding confeſſion of others integritie.

Vpon their ſeizing the

MAGAZINS,

AND

FORTS.

THe beginning of all warr may be deſcerned by the Councells, and preparations foregoing, not only by the firſt Act of hoſtilitie. And by Councells, and preparations foregoing, ſuch as were the alteration of the Government, which this breaker confeſſes to be their cheife end, and without which noe peace could be graunted, we may eaſily conclude, who made the firſt Act of hoſtilitie, for theſe pretences, which he muſters vp have neither the nature of Councells, nor preparations for the warr, but are made excuſes for Acts of hoſtilitie, which they would not have pretended, had they not begun the warr. The particulars neede not examination, but ſhall only be named to lay open the nakednes of their pretences.

And firſt he ſayes *noe King had ever more love at his firſt comming to the Crowne.* Its true, but that moved envy in the ſeditious faction, who ſought to infuſe contrary inclinations into the people.

He ſayes *never people were worſe requited firſt by his miſtruſt, that their liberties were the impairing of his Regall power.* He had ſoone cauſe to miſtruſt, that the conſpiratours plotted to vndermine his Regall power, vpon pretence of the peoples rights, & to that purpoſe rayſed jealoſies among them, the originall of all Rebellion.

Next by his hatred to all thoſe, who were eſteemed Religious, doubting, that their principles too much aſſerted libertie. His Majeſt: profeſſion, and practice

tice ſufficiently vindicate him from this aſperſion to hate thoſe, that were eſteemed Religious, but his pietie permitted him not to eſteeme hipocriticall ſectaries Religious, and his prudence inſtructed him, that theſe ſchiſmatickes, which this Libeller calls Religious maintained principles deſtructive to Government, which they then abiured, but now avow.

That this was ſeene *by his perſecuting*, which was never ſeene, for *the diſſolution of Parliaments* he hath been already anſweared, but the vntruth, which he hath added, whether more ridiculous, or abominable may not paſſe vnobſerved, which is, *that theſe diſſolutions were after they had graunted more money, then would have bought the Turke out af Morea, and ſet free all the greekes.* And yet the Parliament gave more to the Scotts for invading England. Doth this groſſe Mountebanque thinke, that the value of a ſubſidie in England, & the number of them, that were graunted to the King are ſoe vnknowne, what owles, and buzzards doth he thinke would caſt their eyes on his papers? ſurely, if they be ſaleable, it is for ſport, or ſcorne, and he might aſwell have ſaid, it was enough to ſubvert the Turkiſh Empire.

He ſayes *the King tooke Councell, how he might ſubdue them to his will.* The reaſon of this pretence is to excuſe their Rebellious conſpiracie to ſubdue him to their will.

The deſigne of German horſe is a bugbeare long ſince derided. *Billetting of Souldiers in all parts.* Which were rayſed, and imployed in that warr, which the Parliament adviſed, ſhewes that impudence it ſelfe is bankerupt in pretences for their villany.

That *the pulpitts reſounded all propertie to the King, and paſſive obedience to the ſubject.* Propertie they medled not with, but it was their dutie to God, to preach the kings ſoveraignitie, & the peoples paſſive obedience, and what affinitie hath ſuch preaching with Councells, and preparations for a Civill warr.

His mention of *exactions* cannot be omitted, though falſe, & impertinent. *Diſarming of Trayned bands* is not done by vſing ſome of their Armes in the publique ſervice, and it was farr from preparation to a Civill warr, to vſe Armes againſt a ſtranger, but what is this, that was done ſoe many yeares before?

The frained bands he ſayes *were the moſt proper ſtrength of a free nation.* And yet they are not permitted in ſome Republiques, though inſtituted, and improved by our Kings.

That *Ammunition was ingroſſed, and kept in the Tower* was farr from the deſigne of a Civil warr on the kings part, it being a right of his prerogative, but a ſigne of their conſpiracie, and intention of Rebellion, that were troubled at the kings care for overſeeing the Ammunition of his Kingdome, and preventing the miſimployment either at home, or abroade.

The

The *not buying without licence*, when noe man was denyed to buy cannot be interpreted a reſtraint, and the high rate could not imply any deſigne of warr, it might be of benifit. But were not all the places of England not only allowed, but commaunded to have their full ſtores for their trained bands, and had not all ſhipps their full proportions of Ammunition? Theſe are potgun preparations for a Civill warr.

But ſayes the Libeller, *theſe were his Councells, either to a Civill warr, if it ſhould happen, or to ſubdue without a warr, which is all one.* Noe doubt its all one in the Authors Judgment, for he eſteemes the meanes to preſerve obedience a ſufficient ground for Rebellion. But if the King provided againſt a Civill warr, if it ſhould happen, is that a reaſon in ſubjects to make it? And doe not they begin the hoſtilitie, by whome this warr happens, and if the Kings preparations were, if a Civill warr ſhould happen, muſt not this Civill warr happen by others, not him, who prepared only to prevent, and defend:

Thus farr he hath left the firſt Act of hoſtilitie vpon his Maſters, and now he comes to the *rayſing of two Armies againſt the Scotss*, which were both diſbanded before this warr begun, and who was the defendent the world well knowes.

But he ſayes *the latter of them was raiſed to the moſt perfidious breaking of a ſolemne pacification.* His rayling ſignifes his owne impietie, and want of matter that inſteede of declaring the fact of the firſt Engliſh hoſtilitie ſeekes for ſcandalls from a Scotch Treatie, and would make the King perfidious in his defence, becauſe they are Traytours in their aſſault.

He comes now to the beginning of this Parliament, and talkes of bringing vp the Armies, and his often decanted *Iriſh Papiſts, and french Army*, that never ſtruke blow to be Councells for beginning a Civill warr, but theſe apparitions were vaniſht long before the warr begun. *The letters to the King of Denmarke* have been ſufficiently cleered from being Councells, or preparations to make a Civill warr, and the Libeller cannot fix any preparations vpon the king, but in caſe a warr ſhould be made vpon him, which was then plotted, and evident to all knowing men.

He ſayes *theſe, and many other were his Councells towards a Civill warr.* If the king ſhould have taken noe Conncell to have reſiſted the violence, not only prepared, but begun againſt him, it had been vnkingly, and vnnaturall, knowing how maliciouſly, and perfidiouſly the conſpiratours had called in the Scots, bribed them with vaſt ſumms of money racked from the people vpon pretence of the kings ſervice, how they had treacherouſly corrupted diverſe officers, and ſouldiers of the kings army, how they had diſperſed falſe reports of him, and his Actions to diſaffect the people, how they had given licence

cence to all lewde persons to preach heresie, and Treason in the pulpits, how they had endeavoured to weaken the bonds of Government by punishing men for observing the lawes, by commending, and rewardinge malefactours, how they had affronted the king, and stirred vp the rabble to threaten violence to him, if he refused their demaunds, and must he not now prepare for his defence, or submit his judgment?

His refusing *to disband that Irish Army* shewes noe intention of his to a Civill warr, but the Rebells earnest sollicitation for the disbanding of that Army, and the English Army, likewise leaving the Scots vndisbanded shewes their false pretentions, and malicious preparations by disarminge the king of all Armies to subdue him to their wil. These Rebells, that seized the *Tower* to strengthen themselves for making a warr would have it beleived, that the Kings keeping it, which had allwayes been in his possession, was a preparation to make a warr, and while they affronted him in his Court every day would have his guard preparations to make a warr.

These waggons of ammunition to be prepared by the King in that low condition, and want of all things for warr, which he then was in, are somewhat strange, although necessary for him against the continued Acts of violence vsed by the Tumults, and avowed by the faction in Parliament, and their continuall preparations for a warr, and it is a demonstration of the Libellers impudence, that would have such contemptible preparations in respect of the Rebells force by land, and sea, and possession of the forts, Navy, and Citie of London, and Magazins of the Kingdome, should be for the making of a warr vpon them, which was in all reason soe vnable to withstand them.

The appearance of some hundreds of horse at Kingston, shewes how greedy they are of pretences, that make such a scare crow a cause of their Rebellion.

And *the Queenes buying of Armes, and the forces raysed in yorke shire* were much lesse then needed, when the Rebells had assumed the Militia of the Kingdome vnder their owne Commaund. And *their petitioning the King for peace* (which the Libeller mentions to be that while) was that the King would submit to their Government, and doe what they required, and with what face now could any ingenuous man deny, that the cheife designe of the warr was either to destroy his person, or force his judgment.

As to act of hostilitie, it is not much materiall, in whome it first begun after such Councells, and preparations. It is materiall to the truth of the fact, whatever the Councells were, but he hath not named a Councell, or preparation for warr but succeeding the designe of Rebellion, and violence begun, against their rage, all that he supposes on the Kings part, that looked towards a warr being only defensive, and on the part of the Rebells plainely oppressive,

But he ſayes *in the Act alſoe the King will be found to have had the precedenice, if not at London by the aſſault of his armed Court vpon the naked people, and his attempt vpon the houſe of Commons, yet certainly at Hull, firſt by his cloſe practices on that Towne, next by his ſeidge.* Was the Kings going with his guard to the houſe of Commons a proper Army to make a warr, they heeretofore called it a breach of priviledge, and is it now growne ſoe big with time to be called a warr? And muſt that, which continued not an hower be defended with an Army rayſed many moneths after? And is his Iron flaile, and the Parliaments Clients, that were ſoe terrible to make lawes by force become a naked people, & the ragged Regiment a formidable Army? But if theſe doe not prove the King to have done the firſt act, for it ſeemes he doubted it would not, yet at Hull he is ſure, and if the King had fortified all, or any of the Townes of his Kingdome, is that the act of warr? Is not the law evident, that he may doe it, and hath it not been the approved practice of all ages? And if he beſeidged Hull, who began the warr, they that ſurprized it, or he that would recover it? And yet the Libeller gravely concludes from this fardle, that the King is truly charged with beginning the warr, though the particulars themſelves evince the contrary.

He ſayes that *at the Iſle of weight, he charged it vpon himſelfe at the publique Treatie.* What he did at that Treatie is well knowne to be in order to the procuring of peace, and though they, that treated with him would have an Act to acquitt them for their ſecuritie, yet that could not alter the fact, and the King tooke nothing on himſelfe by conſenting to paſſe an act, if the Treatie tooke effect, which act by law, to whoſe interpretation only it was ſubject, could not be expounded to charge the king with the beginning of that warr, but ſo mainfeſt is the vntruth of their pretence, that they would aide their cauſe by inferences from an Act of their owne importunitie, and violence for their owne ſecuritie.

He ſayes *the ſecuring of Hull was noe ſurpriſal, but a timely prevention.* But was it not allwayes in the Kings power, and Cuſtodie before, and what they did to Hull, they did to his other Caſtles, and is it noe ſurprizall to diſpoſſeſſe thoſe, that are in poſſeſſion?

He ſayes *it were folly beyound ridiculous to count our ſelves a free nation, if the King againſt the Parliament might appropriate to himſelfe the ſtrength of a whole nation, as his proper goods.* And is it leſſe ridiculous to count themſelves a free nation, if the Parliament may appropriate to themſelves all the ſtrength of the kingdome, as their owne proper goods againſt al the people, are they more a free nation, becauſe they have many Maſters? Our nation juſtly accounted it ſelfe a free nation, and yet a king had all the ſtrength of the kingdome appropriated to him, as his owne proper goods, and they have ſeene how their libertie was preſerved by that conſtitution, & how it hath been loſt by vſurpation of this right in the name of Parliament.

The

The Parliament had never *the life, and death of lawes in their power*, and the people never thought it for their Securitie, that they ſhould, and the Libeller may with as good reaſon call ſucceeding acts preventions aſwell, as this taking of Hull *a Securing*. Are not the taking of Townes Acts of hoſtilitie vnder what name ſoever, had not the taking of Hull been an Act of hoſtilitie in an Enemy? And is it leſſe in a Rebell? The queſtion is now of an act of hoſtilitie, not the right of it, and that the taking af a Towne is not an act of hoſtilitie wilbe incredible to the meaneſt capacitie, and noe leſſe, that the Parliament have a power of hoſtilitie againſt the king,

He ſayes *the law of the land is at beſt but the reaſon of Parliament*. And the reaſon of Parliament is noe reaſon if it diffet from the opinion of Sectaries, witnes his cenſure of voting the kings conceſſions a ground for peace: & it were as diſſonant from law, as reaſon, that a kingly Government ſhould be ſubject to the reaſon of a Major part in Parliament.

The king ſayes, *they knew his cheifeſt Armes left him were thoſe only, which the ancient Chriſtians were wont to vſe againſt their perſecutors, prayers, and teares*. At this the Libeller makes an exclamation, O *Sacred reverence of God, reſpect, and ſhame of men, whither were ye fled, when theſe hipocriſies were vttered? Was the Kingdome at all that coſt of blood to remove prayers, and teares*. Shakeſpeare could not have framed a fitter exclamation for Rich. 3. Doubtles reverence of God, reſpect, and ſhame of men are fled from this man, that makes this vaine, & prophane outcry. Doth it follow, that becauſe the King got ſtrength, therefore he was poſſeſt of it, when they rebelled againſt him? doth not he reproach him, that all his adherents hardly amounted to the making vp of one ragged Regiment ſtrong enough to aſſault the vnarmed houſe of Commons? And can he thinke there is a God, that cryes out ſacred reverence of God, vpon occaſion of theſe words of his Majeſt: was ever king more deſtitute of aide, and might more truly vſe that expreſſion then he. Thoſe *thouſands of Cavileers*, whoſe number he ſoe often deſpiſed, and now advances are a conviction of his contempt of God, and men, and his prophanes is more abominable, then any oaths, curſes, and carouſes he ſuppoſes. And *the numbers muſtred on Heworth Moore* were a ſufficient proofe of the Kings want of Armes to make a warr, as they were then the matter of the Rebells ſcorne, & were not the Libeller as vaine, as wicked, he would not have mentioned the ſale of the *Crowne Iewells*, to buy Armes for a ground of his exclamation, when nothing could ſhame him more, were he capable of it, for may not a man juſtly ſay, that the cheifeſt Armes left a King were prayers, & teares, when all his viſible meanes to procure Armes were the Jewells of his Crowne? & thoſe guns, which were bought with the Jewells, he calls *deadly inſtruments of warr*, but the inſtruments of Rebells are harmeles, and vnkilling. Men of corrupt conſciences thinke they may prophane the name of God at

their pleaſure by making their lewde conſtructions of words, and Actions. And although this libeller jeere at the Kings weakenes in the beginning of this warr, which was viſible to all the world, & the ſtrength he found was vnexpected by his Enemies, and that all men judged prayers, and teares his cheifeſt Armes, yet becauſe ſtrength came to him, the Libeller calls *Ammunition, Regiments, and Brigades, prayers, and teares*, his ordinary Armes being ſlander, vntruth, and prophanes.

In his next words he ſayes, *they, who fought for the Commonwealth have by the helpe of better prayers vanquiſhed.* It ſeemes he holds not their prayers their cheifeſt Armes, who truſted more in other Armes, then their prayers, and might thence have reaſonably concluded, that their ſucces was not given to their prayers, but permitted for the ſins, & ſcourge of the nation.

The King *reckons not the want of the Militia in reference to his owne protection, as his peoples. Not conſidering* ſayes the Libeller, *how ill for ſeventeene yeares he had protected them, and the miſeries are like a forked Arrow, it cannot be drawne out without inciſion of more fleſh.* He hath told vs, that thoſe miſeries of ſeventeene yeares were peace, and plentie, which thoſe merciles Phiſitians will cure by an endles warr, letting out the blood, and tearing the fleſh of the afflicted people, and wee now deſcerne what Phiſike they intended for the Kingdome. Sawes to dismember them, ſwords to lance them, and famine to pine them, till they were ſufficiently purged of their former proſperitie, and he neede not have vſed ſoe many ſhifts to deny the beginning of the warr, when he ſayes the cure of the Kingdome was to be made with inciſions. What want of protection appeared in thoſe ſeventeene yeares, never people were more ſecure? But the man miſtakes the ſcene of his exclamation, as his Sermonizers there notes, & tell the people of ſuffring that knew none among them.

He ſayes *the wings of faith may be miſtaken for the wings of preſumption*, Preſumptuous men are miſtaken of the wings of faith, and this Libeller hath ſufficiently expreſt himſelfe one of them, and may feare by his preſumption to fall head long.

The King ſayes, *that the Parliament have hung the Majeſt: of King-ſhipp in an airy imagination of Regalitie betweene the priviledges of both houſes, like the tombe of Mahomett.* To this ſayes the Libeller, *he knew not that he was propheſying the death, and buriall of a turkiſh Tyrany, that ſpurned downe thoſe lawes, which gave it life, and being, ſoe ſtrong, as it endured to be a regulated Monarchy*, he was not propheſying, but relating a plaine ſtory how a juſt Monarchy was oppreſt by a Turkiſh impoſture, and Tyrany, and an Empire ſett vp in an Army of Janizaries, that ſpurned downe al law, and Religion, and as the Turkiſh doctrine of propogating their ſuperſtition by blood, and warr was preached vnto the people, as their dutie to doe the like for their new hereticall fancies, ſoe their deceites

deceites in making the King a fantaſtique ſuppoſition, and his authoritie nothing els, but the opinions of the two houſes was as groſſe, and lewde, as the imaginary Miracle of Mahometts Tombe.

From the Kings words touching the vſe of the Militia, *that he would but defend himſelfe ſoe farr, as to defend his good ſubjects from theſe mens violence, who perſwade the world, that none but wolves are fitt to be truſted with the Cuſtody of the ſheepeheard, and his flocke.* The Libeller would inferr this a cleere confeſſion from his owne mouth, that *if the Parliament had left him the ſole power of the Militia, he would have vſed it to the deſtruction of them, and their friends.* And is an vſe for defence againſt wrong, and fraude, an vſe to deſtruction? And if the faction called Parliament be not permitted to deſtroy the ſheepeheard, and his flocke, is it a deſtruction to them? But they knew themſelves wolves, and could not be ſecure, while any power was out of their hands, & therefore would perſwade, that they were fitteſt to be truſted with that, which was the ſole defence againſt their rapacitie.

He ſayes *the King hath been often told, that he had noe more power over the ſword, then the law.* But who told him ſoe? Never any but knowne Rebells Parliaments have allwayes ſaid the contrary, and the practice of it in all times was never queſtioned. Though Kings cannot be ordinary Judges, yet all Juſtice flowes from them, and by their Commiſſions, and becauſe their condition, and place requires, that Juſtice be adminiſtred by their deputies according to the Cuſtome of all Governments, therefore they have not power to vſe the Militia, which is moſt proper to their place, and cannot be ſeperated from their perſon, could not be told by reaſonable men.

The pretended feare of Rebells, that *he may by this power controll the law* they will not extend to their owne power of the militia, and may not their Rebell generall controll all lawes by the power of his Army? And doth he not? The ſubjects of England vnderſtood the ſecuritie of their lawes to reſt in their King, whoſe intereſt they knew it was to preſerve them. Tyrany, and breach of lawes would make his Eſtate vnſecure, and dangerous, and therefore they fought to defend him againſt ſuch, as would deſtroy their lawes, and him. But in this clamour of the Libeller he only ſeekes to vilifie Monarchicall Government, and to perſwade all people, that live vnder Kings, that they are not free, and vnderſtand not what is libertie, as is in other formes of Government the people were not Commaunded, and might chuſe their owne lawes, and order their warrs. There is frequent experience in the Roman Commonwealth of the Rebellion of the people vnder ptetence of libertie, and ſeditious inclinations will aſſoone take occaſion to object Tyrany to ſenates, & Parliaments, as kings What ſtate can thoſe Rebells frame, that may not degenerate into a Tyrany,

but they only ſeeke pretences for their Rebellion againſt the preſent Government to transferr it to themſelves.

The King is contented to reſigne his power for his owne time. And ſayes the Libeller *he is carefull, wee ſhould be ſlaves to his poſteritie, and leaue vs the legaice of another warr about it.* There is noe doubt, but the Rebells deſired the Militia to enſlave the people, and deſtroy the king, and they would rather be devills then ſubjects. This Libeller makes noe difference betweene a ſubject, and a ſlave, and though they pretended the ſetling of the Militia in reſpect of preſent danger, yet they are ſoe impudent to reject the kings offer to ſettle it for his owne time.

He ſayes *the King calls the Parliament a many headed Hydra of Government, and not more eyes then mouths,* which he falſely recites, for the King ſayes, *As this many headed Hydra of Government makes a ſhew to the people to have more eyes to ſee, ſoe they will finde it to have more mouths too to be ſatiſfied,* and heere the Libeller according to his cuſtome anſweares ſenſe with non ſenſe, for he ſayes, *ſurely not more mouths, nor ſoe wide, as the diſſolute rabble of his Courtiers both hees, and ſhees, if there were any males among them.* Doth he make a queſtion, whether any males, and yet talke of a diſſolute rabble? And are the new ſenatours commaunded ſingle life to prevent the generation of Traytours? But the Kingdome findes, that thoſe numbers of leane kine have devoured more in ſeven yeares, then all the Courtiers in ſeven hundred.

He ſayes *to diſpute what kinde of Government is beſt would prove a long Theame, it ſufficeth, that his reaſons heere for Monarchy are found weake, and inconſiderable.* We have the word of a grave Author for it, who hath made long invectives, & yet never handled the Theame, nor anſweared any one reaſon produced for Monarchy, & though it be a long Theame to diſpute what Government were beſt in his judgment, yet he might have made the queſtion ſhorter by diſputing, whether ſubjects might Rebell to ſubvert the Monarchy vnder which they live, And he would have Tyrany a ground for Rebellion, and that Tyrany to be Monarchy, aud if the diſpute be long, the ſolution wilbe very eaſie.

The King is not our ſun, though he would be taken for it. And why did he ſay, that the ſun in all figurative vſe, and ſignification beares alluſion to a King, & blames the king for his compariſon of the Earle of Strafford, and heere reprehends the alluſion to himſelfe? but they wilbe the ſun, and ſet the world on fire.

He aſkes *wherefore we ſhould not hope to be governed more happily without a King, when all our miſerie hath been by a King, or by our neceſſary vindication, and defence againſt him.* He may not well hope to be governed happily by thoſe, that have gotten power by wicked Arts. An vnjuſt power wil ſeeke to ſupport it ſelfe by the ſame meanes it was rayſed: It cannot be hoped, that they will governe happily, that ſeeke the oppreſſion of the greateſt part of the people, and that can ſecure their private for-

fortunes, what ever become of the Kingdome. They cannott hope for Gods bleſſing, which only can make happy vpon the many wilfull, perjuries, hipocriſies, & cruelties, which they vſed to vſurpe this Government, and the perſecution, and murther of their lawfull ſoveraigne, and they, that pretēded miſerie they knew not for a ground to change their Government, will finde it by their folly, and madnes.

He ſayes *the King would be thought enforced to perjury by having graunted the Militia, by which his oath bound him to protect the people.* The Libeller aſkes, *if he can be perjured in graunting that, why doth he refuſe for no other cauſe the aboliſhing of Epiſcopacie?* The Libeller himſelfe hath expreſt other cauſes of his refuſall to aboliſh Epiſcopacie, but why may not one be perjured in both, being equally bound by his oath. If the Libeller have a ſenſe in this, its very miſticall, vnles he meane, that a man neede not feare many perjuries, that committed one.

The protection of Delinquents was no part of his oath, *but of the innocent*, and that he ought to doe againſt popular fury, and any vſurpt authoritie vnder what name ſoever.

That he was *to protect by ſuch hands, as the Parliament ſhould adviſe him*, was noe part of his oath, and he could poorely protect, that muſt expect ſuch hands, as others ſhould allow him, that were an oath to as litle vſe, as the power it ſuppoſed.

He may not hold a violent, and incommunicable ſword over vs vnder the ſhew of protection. And muſt there not be a ſword of protection, becauſe it may be turned to violence, this is Rebells Logicke, that would have no Judges, becauſe they may be corrupt? & theſe, that terrifie the people with the dangers of violence vnder lawfull Governours vſe power moſt Tyranically, but wherefore *incommunicable*, he thinkes it a thundering word to ſtartle the people like Arbitrary Government, and fundamentall lawes. Is the ſword of the ſupreame power communicable, if it be in many hands, what if they fight one with another, which is the ſword then to protect the people, and how will they fight for their Liberties?

The King ſayes, *that his yeilding the Militia was from the love of publique peace, and aſſurance of Gods protection.* The Libeller aſkes, *wherefore this aſſurance of Gods protection came not till the Militia was wrung out of his hands.* Whence can he conclude, that it came not till then? But the wringing of the Militia out of his hands ſhewes how impudently theſe men pretend right, or truth for their Actions, muſt a man give vp his ſtrength, when it is demaunded, becauſe he hath an aſſurance of Gods protection, and becauſe he ſees ſome reaſon to part with it, as the king did for love of publique peace, muſt he not therefore have an aſſurance of Gods protection? his holding it faſt was his dutie, and the wringing it from him hath open injuſtice both in the Act, and intention. And the Libellers prophanes in jeering at the kings ſaying, that *God was able abun-*

abundantly to compenſate him, as he did to Iob whatever honour, power, or libertie Chaldeans, Sabeans, or the Devill himſelfe deprived him of ſaying *Iob vſed noe Militia, nor Magazine at Hull.* Is not vnlike the Apoſtates ſcoffing at the Chriſtians patience, and ſuffering.

The King ſayes, *Although they take all from him, yet can they not obſtruct his way to heaven.* The libeller ſayes, *tis noe handſome occaſion to tell vs whither he was going.* And hath it been an vnhandſome occaſion in the ſaints of God to take occaſion from their afflictions to declare their reſolutions? But theſe are his common cenſures.

He ſayes *private prayers in publique aſke ſomething of whome they aſke not.* But prayers vpon a publique occaſion loſe not their reward for being publique.

Vpon the

NINETEENE PROPOSITIONS.

THE *King vſes plauſibilitie of large, and indefinite words to defend himſelfe at ſuch diſtance, as may hinder the eye of Common Iudgment from all diſtinct view, and examination of his reaſoning.* It is the Libellers labour to keepe his reaſoning from Common view, and therefore ſeekes to divert the readers by Chimericall ſuppoſitions, and invectives againſt Monarchy, and repeated common places of miſgovernment. Vpon examination the Kings plaine, and diſtinct reaſoning will appeare convincing to every right judgment.

The Libeller ſayes. *The king ſhewes not, how it can happen, that the peace of a people ſhould be inconſiſtent with the conſcience, and honour of a King.* And doth this man hold, that the King ought to ſacrifiſe Religion, Juſtice, and pietie for the peace of his people? Shall he deſtroy innocent men, and perſecute Chriſtians to procure peace? Or are theſe things conſiſtent with honour, & conſcience? and may not ſuch things be deſired by a wicked people in order to peace? And therefore the Libeller vainely preſſes, that *nothing is more agreeable to the conſcience, and honour of a King, then to preſerve his ſubjects in peace.*

And

And is there anything more contrary to the conſcience, & dutie of ſubjects, then to procure a Civill warr, by demaunding conceſſions of their King, which in honour, and conſcience he cannot graunt, & which being graunted would be noe ground for a laſting peace, though it avoyded a preſent warr.

The Libeller aſkes *which of the propoſitions were obtruded on him with the point of the ſword, till he with the point of the ſword thruſt from him both propoſitions, and propounders.* A ſtrange queſtion in this Libeller, that hath ſoe often obtruded the feares, and terrours rayſed in the King by the Tumults, and Iron flaile, ſeizing of the Magazins, and not leaving him a ſword, that had a point to thruſt, but this Theame is too much ſoyled by ſoe often repetition, and yet he proceedes to talke of *merciles obtruſions, which for almoſt twentie yeares the King had been forcing upon tender conſciences by all ſorts of perſecutions.* And theſe tender conſciences he will allow to be preferred before the peace of the Kingdome. Truly theſe are not large, and indefinite words, but apparent abſurdities to the eye of every Common judgment, that the pretended conſcience of every hipocriticall ſectarie muſt be preferred to the peace of a Kingdome, and the King muſt be allowed none, but ſoſe life, and Kingdome, or proſtitute his conſcience. The Libellers examination of the Kings booke, it ſeemes was noe other, then of his owne writings, that huddles vp contradictions, and abſurdities ſoe obvious to the firſt ſight. His labour to declaime againſt *perſecution* is not matter of fact, and the impertinencie of it hath been already ſufficiently detected.

The king ſayes *Many things are required of him, nothing offred in requitall.* And the Libeller demaunds.. *What could ſatiate the deſires of this man, who being King of England, and Maſter of almoſt two millions yearely was ſtill in want.* And yet the Maſters in the new ſtate affirme in their declaration, that the conſtant Revenue of the Crowne exceeded not a hundred thouſand pound a yeare, And why ſhould not the King expect contributions from his ſubjects, aſwell as al his Predeceſſours ſtill had? And why will this man deny him ſupplies, that ſoe often obtrudes his wants, and he will have the King content with Rebells Charitie, and allowes them to take al from him, when they liſt, as the ſubjects money, this is the ſupreame honour, and Revenue, that the king ought to content himſelfe with.

It was for honours ſake, that they put the King vpon the giving part, not that it belonged to him of right, for he ſayes *all Lawes are in the hands of the Parliament, and King-ſhipp it ſelfe.* He ſayes it, and yet we muſt beleive him, that England was a Monarchy, if the Majeſtie were not in the king, how was it other, then a republique, and it was for honours ſake, that they have been ſubjects theſe many hundred yeares, wherefore would he have the world beleive warrs were made betweene competitours for the Crowne of England; was it only to be a king in a play,

but we finde, that what Rebells can attaine by power, they will affert for right, and they, which have had ſoe many denialls, and have profeſſed conſcientious, ſubjection at laſt come to ſay, it was for honours ſake, and of forme, not neceſſitie, that they were ſubjects.

The Libeller proceedes to ſhew, that *Monarchy cannot permit the requiſites neceſſary to ſocietie.* That *the will of one man in Government is contrary to freedome.* And why not the will of five hundred to the freedome of the reſt, as much as that one? Theſe men thinke that their clamour againſt the power of one man hes a greate influence vpon the ignorant people, which might have had ſome beleife before they had tryed their new Maſters. If we looke vpon the moſt ancient ſtories of the world, we finde the people both in peace, and warr commaunded by one man, nature teaching the neceſſitie of one generall in an Army, and the Government, which God himſelfe appointed to his people was by one man, and as moyſes was at firſt, ſoe were his ſucceſſours, and the kings after Saul, and David, and this Libeller can ſpeake nothing of this power of one man, but muſt cenſure, and vilifie Gods owne inſtitution, he offers nothing againſt Monarchy but what hes equall oppoſition to Parliament, and all formes of Government, for the peoples good, for which he ſayes the king hath his rights, will aſſoone become a pretence for Rebellion againſt any Rulers, as kings.

His denyall, that *the King is not greater then his Parliament*, is only oppoſinge his bare word to all ſenſe, and reaſon, for doth the greater petition the leſſe, and yet the Parliament conſtantly petition the king.

He ſayes *the King can doe noe wrong.* And have not they then, that pretend he had done wrong committed diſobedience, and wrong?

The King can doe noe right but in his Courts. And if they be his Courts, and his deputies, and doe all in his name, doth it not follow, that it is his doing? And though the kings ſitt not ordinarily in their Courts, yet they have often ſate in ſeverall Courts, and in Parliament the King himſelfe gives orders, as appeares by the Preſidents of all times, and wherefore did the Parliament preferre their petition of right to the King, and importuned his anſweare, if he had noe power to doe right, but by his Courts? But what concernes the adminiſtration of Juſtice by deputies is not peculiar to England, but to all other Kingdomes.

Without his Courts he is noe King. And yet they are his Courts, and cannot ſitt, but by his graunt.

If the King doe wrong in the higheſt degree, he muſt doe it, as a Tyrant, not as a King of England. But he is ſtill King of England, though a Tyrant, and if ſubjects may judge their King, the ordinary acts of ſoveraigntie wilbe wrong in the higheſt degree.

If

If he cannot, as one greater, give oft to the Parliament, as the Libeller ſuppoſes, and *that it may be termed the Courteſie of England to aske any thing of the King*. They would not have importuned the Acts, that have paſſed this Parliament, nor have vſed their Iron flaile to obteine them, and by his rule ſubjection is noe more the Courteſie of England, then all other Countreyes,

We never forced him to part with his conſcience, but it is he, that would have forced vs to part with ours, and doth he that refuſes the demaund of another, force his conſcience, that demaunds? Doth the Kings denyall force his ſubjects conſciences, becauſe they force themſelves to Rebell? and enforce him to ſay what they will have him.

The Authors deſcant vpon the Kings words of the *incommunicable Iewell of his conſcience* diſcovers, how he hath expoſed his owne to the flatterie, and ſlaverie of his Maſters, and had he thoughts of conſcience he would not have valued it at the baſeſt price.

The breeding of Moſt kings hath ever been ſenſuall, and moſt humoured. He ſpeakes it of his owne ſenſe, and inclination to ſuch baſe offices. Kings have greateſt cauſe to avoyde ſuch breeding, and perſons of ſuch condition.

The kings diſſent from his whole kingdome is a ſuppoſition of that, which never was, and were impoſſible ever to happen, but ſhould it happen, they that are governed muſt ſubmitt to the governour, and that by all the Rules of divine, and humane law.

The Libeller ſaying *the king preferrs his love of truth before the love of his people* the Kings words are, *the love I have of my peoples place hath greate influence vpon me, but the love of truth, and inward peace hath more.* And who thinkes not, that it ought to have ſoe? For *his ſearch of truth*, he had gone amiſſe, if he had reſted on thoſe propounders, which the Libeller preſcribes him. And that *vnaccountable Prerogative*, which the Libeller ſayes *is the truth he loves*, would have been judged a truth by the Libeller, if he had reteined either feare of God, or love to his Countrey.

It is our ill hap, that three kingdomes ſhould be peſtred with one conſcience, which ſcrupled to graunt what the Parliament adviſed him. But it was the miſerie of the three kingdomes, that a faction of depraved men, that had caſt away conſcience ſhould overſway the Parliament, and demaund graunts for their owne ambition againſt the kingdome.

Theſe ſcruples to many he ſayes *ſeeme pretended, to others vpon as good grounds may ſeeme reall.* And to this it ſeemes the Libeller inclines, for noe reaſon wil permitt, that he ſhould ſuffer ſoe much vpon a pretence of conſcience.

It was the juſt judgment of God, that he, who was ſoe cruell, and remorſeles to other mens conſciences, ſhould have a conſcience ſoe cruell to himſelfe.

And were not they, that were ſoe cruell to his conſcience, condemned by their owne being heerein the inſtruments of hell to afflict the conſciences of others, but theſe miſcreants can ſport themſelves with their owne ſins, and others ſufferings. Hath he made aſmuch as a pretence of the Kings crueltie to any mans innocencie.

The Libeller recites, that the King ſaid *he thought fit to deny ſome things in honour, & Policie, though he could approve them*, which is not at al ſaid by the King, but that *ſome things, which a King might approve, yet in honour, & Policie might be denyed at ſome time to ſome men.* And who doubts it, can there be a want of ſuch conſiderations in a King?

Good Princes thought it their happines to be allwayes graunting. How could that be, if it be true, which he ſayes they had nothing to graunt? But good ſubjects never demaunded that, which ſhould make their King vnable to graunt any more.

He remembers himſelfe now, that *good things were to be graunted for the things ſake, indifferent things for the peoples ſake*, and he hath made it his continued Theame, that the King could graunt nothing in favour, but all was neceſſary in Juſtice, and it is apparent, that the kings large conceſſions invited theſe ingratefull Rebells to make thoſe ſhameles demaunds, which themſelves knew noe king in honour, Policie, and Juſtice could graunt.

Vndoubtedly his Coronation oath bindes him to a generall, and implicite conſent to whatever the Parliament deſired. And then vndoubtedly the king muſt be in worſe condition then any ſubject, for noe man but he is bound to ſuch a blinde obedience, and it is a ſtrange blindenes in this man to offer ſuch a thing to be beleived, which himſelfe holds incredible, for he ſayes, *the Kings oath cannot binde him againſt neceſſary reformation.* And can it then binde him to make wicked lawes, which muſt be reformed? Is the Parliament infallible, & may they not make ill lawes? What is the reaſon, that the Libeller, and his Sectaries would not give obedience to Acts of Parliament vpon pretence of conſcience, & ought the king to conſent to ſuch lawes, as the ſubjects ought not to obey?

The King ought not to vie wiſedome with the Parliament, and why then doe the Libeller, and his Sectaries vie wiſedome with all former Parliaments?

Any of the Parliament may as farr excell him in the guift of wiſedome, as he them in place, and dignitie. But its very vnlike, and neere to impoſſible, eſpecially, if we looke to the experience of all times, and it is often found, that a King is wiſer, then all his Councell; And though the libeller ſay *ſure it was not he*, meaning the King: as wiſe men, as any of his Councell, or Parliament thought it was he, & never good ſubjects contended with their King for that compariſon.

The king ſayes, *that that were, as if Sampſon ſhould have conſented to put out his eyes, that the Philiſtins might with more ſafetie mocke, and abuſe him.*

And

And this ſayes the Libeller *out of an vnwiſe, or pretended feare of ſcorne for yeilding to his Parliament, he gives cauſe of ſuſpition, that he made a ſcorne of his Regall oath.* Could any man ſuſpect, that his Regall oath bound him to ſuch a diſpicable ſlavery, that a king ſhould be in greater bondage to his Parliament, then any vaſſall to a Lord, a king might juſtly ſcorne ſuch an oath, that would make him ſcorned by all, when he had taken it, but the Libeller had noe better anſweare, and therefore retreates to his Common refuge of inſignificant repetition.

The King ſayes *to exclude him from all power of denyall ſeemes an arrogance,* The Libeller adds *in the Parliament he meanes,* and askes, *what in him then to deny againſt the Parliament.* It is no arrogance to deny in him, that is aſked, but arrogance in him, that aſkes, to receive noe denyall.

The king ſayes *its leaſt of all becomminge thoſe, that make their addreſſes in a humble, and loyall way of petitioning, who by that confeſſe their inferioritie, which oblidgeth them to reſt, if not ſatisfied, yet quieted with ſuch an anſweare, as the will, and reaſon of the ſuperiour thinkes fitt to give.* To this the Libeller ſayes, *petitioning in better Engliſh is noe more then requeſting, or requiring.* And is it not good Engliſh to call our prayers pititions, and is it better Engliſh to ſay wee require, when we pray, and is requeſting, and requiring the ſame in good Engliſh? Is the petitioning of his new Maſters requeſting, or requiring?

Men require not favours only, but their due, and that not only from ſuperiours, but equalls, and inferiours. Its the firſt time, that ſuch requiring of favours was heard of, and a ſorry inference, that becauſe men require of equalls, they may of ſuperiours, and that there is noe difference betweene ſuperioritie of Government, and ſuperioritie in fortune, or Title.

It was called, petitio conſulatus, when the nobleſt Romans went about, and begged that dignitie of the meaneſt plebeians naming them man by man. But might not thoſe, to whome they went, deny their petition? Could they require their election, as due, and was their begging, requiring? He would willingly make badd Engliſh out of good Lattyn, though good Lattin may be noe good manners from a ſubject to his king, and it is abſurd in Government for any to pray, that ought to commaund? & the Libeller ſeemes diſtracted that would have petitioning requiring, and prove it by the ſignification it hath of begging.

They petitioned not, becauſe all of them were inferiour, but becauſe he was ſuperiour to any of them. But why then doe they petition in their politique Capacitie as a Parliament? He tells vs at laſt, *it was for faſhions ſake more then dutie.* But why then did they profeſſe it to be their dutie? He tells vs the Miſteries of their Religion, their profeſſions, and promiſes are Ceremonies, their ſubmiſſions for faſhion, this is the doctrine of cut throates.

By plaine law cited before, the Parliament is his ſuperiour. And why had he not brought in petitio principy, as well as petitio conſulatus vſing it ſoe often, and that in good Engliſh is begging the queſtion. Doubtles he thinkes, that ſome beleive it is plaine law, becauſe he ſaith ſoe, but ſuch, as reade his booke finde he vnderſtands not law, nor reaſon, and will not ſpeake the truth, he vnderſtands

It were a mad law, that would ſubject reaſon to ſuperioritie of place. And doth not himſelfe ſay it, that the Parliament is ſuperiour, and therefore the kings reaſon muſt be ſubject to it? and is not he mad, or ſenſeles?

He returnes againe to his invective againſt *Monarchy, and one mans will*, and ſoe its only the kings Cryme, that he was a Monarch, and if the King be not bound in a blinde obedience to all, that the Parliament requires, we muſt all be ſlaves, a proper inference, and vpon this he concludes, that *petitioning was but forme*, becauſe he doth not like the Kingly Government.

It cannot be ſoe abſurd to binde the King to a blinde obedience as to confine the Parliaments reaſon to the will of one man. Much more abſurd to bind the King, and leave ſubjects vnconfined.

That *the King did nothing, but what was oppoſite to his profeſſed intereſt*, cannot be ſuppoſed, but in his conceſſions to the late Parliament, and we finde by ſad experience, that nothing is more ruinous to the Kingdome, then a power in the Parliament over the King, and they have been ſoe farr from a power *to confine the exorbitancie of Kings*, that thoſe illegall conventions, which acted the Tragedies of ſome Kings were but the ſtales to vſurpers, and moulded to their will.

That the King called them *young ſtatesmen* he imputes to *arrogance*. Doubtles the King might have ſaid much more, then what he did, that moſt part of theſe propounders were young ſtateſmen, Is there a man in England, that doubts it, if he regard either age, or experience, how they have governed themſelves, and the Kingdome all men ſee, who from ſoe greate tranquilitie have turned it into a lamentable combuſtion, and deſpiſed the Kingdomes intereſt both at home, and abroade, that *Phaetons miſcarriage* was never ſoe anſweared by the practice of any raſh, and precipitate medlers in affaires of ſtate, as theſe vſurpers, and as they drove furiouſly with *Iehu*, ſoe they practized his hipocriſie, that loved the Kingdome better then the commaunds of God, and departed not from the ſins of Jeroboam, though he pretended Zeale for the Lord, and that *omen* of confuſion from ſuch fury, and madnes, his Majeſt: prayed God to divert, but the Libeller is pleaſed with his owne prognoſtickes, and makes augury a warrant for any villany, though the wickednes of his Maſters may give juſt occaſion to thinke, their vengeance ſleepes not.

He

He comes now to dictate law, and tumbling of his repetitions, that *the Parliament sit not, as subjects, but superiours, called not by him, but by the law.* And doth not this man know the Parliament sayes all this is false, and that they are his subjects, and called by his writ. Surely this Libeller takes pleasure in outfacing all truth, otherwise he would not vse such absurd, and palpable fallities, and that after himselfe had said the king was trusted with the summoning, and dissolving of Parliaments.

Vnreasonable desires might be vnexpected by the king, and denyed. Wee may see, that *Iehues fury, and Phaetons rashnes* were not ill remembred to these men, that held *the enforcing of old lawes, repairing of injuries, moderate desires of reformation*, soe contemptible, that nothing, but the rooting vp of the foundation of Government could be a remedie for the kingdome, whose greate prosperitie was their greatest greivance, and all those good lawes, which he commends were vseles, and to noe purpose.

That they, which came to the Parliament had no authoritie to *redresse greivances, but to desire the redresse*, was acknowledged a truth by the late Parliamēt, befor their insolēce was confirmed by the kings concessions.

That *their Fathers made as vast alterations to free themselves from ancient Popery* is much mistaken, for whoever lookes into the reformation of Religion in England shall finde, that it moved from the head, and that the Parliament conformed themselves vnto the Counsells taken by the king, and made not the alterations the Libeller supposes. Alterations were made, where corruptions had entred into doctrine, or practice, but it was very farr from esteeming the primitive Church, a time of superstition, and plucking vp by the rootes, what ever was planted in the first ages of the Church. Sectaries are not to be judges of what varies from Scripture, their opinions arising from disobedience, must needes be full of errour, and schisme, and his Majest: had good reason to preferre the doctrine, and practice of the primitive Church before any moderne opinion of reformation, and as all the pregnant, and solid reasons of the Chnrches beyound the seas wrought lesse with the faction in Parliament, then the Tumults, and rabbles, soe farr lesse with this Libeller, that defends a schisme from them all vnder the divided Conventicles of Independancy, and a crew of ignorant, and irreligious Hobgoblins that eate the fat of robbery, and oppression. And he heere pretends the example of all the reformed Churches against Episcopacie, and afterwards confesses the Lutherans, who are the greater part of a contrary practice.

The fallhood, & giddines of their oracles are more ridiculous, thē ever were *the superstitious pilgramages of blinde votaries*. he, that thus reprehends the kings oppositiō to the change of Church Government, while he strives for innovation exclaimes against it, as a Cryme, for he sayes

they

they would *vindicate the Government of the Church, innovated, & corrupted*, he ſhould have ſhewed from what time it was corrupted.

The king ſayes, *ſuch, as were looked vpon before as factions in the ſtate, & Schiſmaticall in the Church demaunded not only tollerations for themſelves in their vanitie, noveltie, and confuſion, but alſoe an extirpatiou of that Government, whoſe rights they had a minde to invade.* And the Libeller askes, *was this man ever likely to be adviſed, who ſetts himſelfe againſt his choſen Councellours, and cenſures the Government of other proteſtant Churches as bad, as any Papiſt.* Certainly ſuch Councellours were very vnfitt to adviſe, that were ſoe ill qualified, ſuch as the lawe judges offenders are incapable to judge of law, & that ſuch were theſe demaunders is evident to al men, that know the lawes, and Government of England. There are noe Proteſtant Churches, that thinke their Government cenſured, if others differ from it, in any particular, but they will hold it a Schiſmaticall inſolence in any to endeavour to alter a Government well ſetled vpon pretence to introduce another againſt the will of the king. It imports not any contempt of the kingdome, if ſuch, as they choſe be found either defective, or falſe, and to engage the kingdome in all the impieties, that men act, which are choſen by them is as abſurd, as vainely pretended by the Libeller who will make a faction prevalent by Tumults, and ſedition to be the kingdome, and the king ſhould have had his kingdome in greate contempt, if he had taken ſuch a faction for the kingdome.

He drawes an Argument *from the penaltie of being a Chriſtian vnder the heathens, and a Proteſtant vnder Papiſts.* And ſurely had they ſought to introduce their Religion with the deſtruction of the Civill ſtate, ſuch a fact would have merited the name of treaſon, but their courſe was contrary to theſe Sectaries, who ſought only to enjoy the libertie of their conſcience, not to enforce others.

That *our ſaviour comming to reforme his Church was accuſed of an intent to invade Cæſars right, as good a right, as ever the Prelate Biſhopps had, the one being gotten by force, the other by ſpirituall vſurpation.* Helpes not the Sectaries, for our ſaviour was innocent of that falſe accuſation, declaring his kingdome not to be of this world, & acknowledged Cæſars right, bidding the people to give vnto Ceſar the things, that were Ceſars, but this mans prophanes would have the accuſation true, and lawfull to invade Ceſars right from the falſe accuſation of our ſaviours, and blaſphemouſly avowes invading of the Biſhopps rights, becauſe one better then ceſars, for to what other purpoſe doth he compare the rights of Ceſar, and the Biſhopps, vnleſſe to juſtifie their dealinge with the Biſhopps. And accuſe our ſaviour for intending the lyke to Cæſar?

The right of the Prelate Biſhopps was gotten by ſpirituall vſurpation. Could any Jew, Turke, or Pagan ſpeake more reproach fully againſt Chriſtiaintie, that the calling of thoſe men, who were ſoe eminent for ſuffering, and Martidome, and gathering the Chriſtian Church throughout the world was a ſpirituall vſurpation?

The

The objection or *to his Majeſt: repeating the arguments from law, antiquitie, Anceſtours, proſperitie, and the like* was very improper from him, whoſe repititions of Tyrany, ſlavery, ſingle voyce, conſent of the kingdome, and ſuch like have blotted ſoe greate a part of his booke, and he, that would binde the king to follow the Example of other Churches will exclude antiquitie, and the primitive Church, and authoriſe the ſchiſme of innovating Sectaries, becauſe Papiſts have vſed Arguments againſt them.

The king ſayes, *had he two houſes ſued out their livery from the wardſhip of Tumults, he could ſooner have beleived them.* But ſayes the Libeller *it concerned them firſt to ſue out their livery from his encroaching Prerogative.* The law allowes noe livery from Royall Prerogative, but judges them Rebells that ſeeke it.

The Character ſett on them, *that hunt after faction with their hounds the Tumults*, the Libeller hath juſtified by his defence.

Its noe ſhame for a King to be *a pupill to the Biſhopps*, whoſe calling it is to give him ſpirituall Councell, but it were madnes to be a laquay to ſuch mē, who take vpon them to judge of the callings in the Church of God, which have noe calling to it, much more to a rabble, whome the Libeller himſelfe holds extravagant.

That *nimrod was the firſt, that hunted after faction* could never be told by the Biſhopps, much leſſe, that he was the firſt, that *founded Monarchy*. The Biſhopps could have named a more ancient foundation in Adam, and Noah. They finde the hunters after faction by Tumults of a latter dale, Corah, and his Company, that Rebelled againſt Moſes, and Sheba, that ſpake to the Tumults, what part have we in David, or portion in the ſonne of Jeſſe: and they finde them in the curſed Jewes, that hunted by the Tumults againſt our Saviour. In Demetrious, and his Craftsmen againſt the Apoſtles, and in Alexander the Copper Smith againſt St. Paul, and thats the *game*, which Rebells in all times *hollowed* to, and the *Mungrell ſort* never faile them, and theſe, that hunt with ſuch hounds preſerve beaſts of prey to devoure the quiett, & profitable.

Certainly Parliaments made lawes before Kings were in being, which muſt have better authoritie then his reaſon to prove; We finde kings making lawes before ever we reade of Parliaments, & in Commonwealths we finde their law makers were ſingle men, as Licurgus, Solon, and diverſe others.

The kings holding his Crowne by law, doth not imply another law maker then the king, who firſt made that law, wherevnto the whole people were ſubject, but he, that ſoe lately blamed repetitions vnſeaſonably falls into his old rode of diſputing againſt *Monarchy*, which he pretends to decline.

It hath been anciently interpreted the preſaging ſigne of a future Tyrant to dreame of copulation with his Mother. Heere is a conceite pluckt in by

head, and ſhoulders. Whereof was it a ſigne in Junious Brutus, that was directed by the oracle to kiſſe his Mother, his ſucceeding act was the expulſion of the kings, and change of the Government, was that leſſe then Tyrany, or not ſoe preſaged by the oracle, aswel as a dreame? Parliaments can be noe Mothers to kings, that are created by kings. The king is by the law of England Father of the Countrey, & the life, and ſoule of the law, but the Libeller will finde out a ſtep Mother an Athalia to deſtroy the ſeede Royall, and ſett her meeſtuous broode vpon the throne; for theſe dreames were the deluſions of ſome prime Rebells, and could not allude vnto juſt Title, but conceites are growne low, when ſuch dreames muſt be fetcht in for reaſons.

And from his dreames, it is not ſtrange, he ſhould fancie alluſions (which himſelfe ſayes are ordinary of the King to the ſun) of force *to ſwell vp Caligula to thinke himſelfe a God.* And becauſe theſe Rebells can not be Gods, they will be Devills.

The King ſayes, *theſe propoſitions are not the joint, and free deſires of both houſes, next that the choiſe of many members was carried by faction.* He ſayes *Charles the fifth againſt the Proteſtants in Germany laid the fault vpon ſome few.* And what is that to the faction in England? If they be not the joint deſires of both houſes, as it was not, ought the King to take it for the advice of Parliament, and forbeare to ſhew the fraude, becauſe Charles the fifth ſaid the like vpon another occaſion.

The Court was wont to tamper with Elections, and he ſayes *noe faction was then more potent.* And yet he affirmes they prevayled not, where then was their potencie?

Becauſe the king ſayes, *he cannot ſwallow ſuch Camells of ſacriledge, and Injuſtice, as others doe,* The Libeller ſayes, *he is the Phariſee, vp, and downe, is not as other men are.* Is it Phariſaiſme to profeſſe with the Prophett David the diſlike of them, that follow ſuperſtitious vainties. Becauſe the Phariſee ſwallowed Camells, be ſuch men Phariſees, that profeſſe they will not? & becauſe the Sectaries pretended conſcience of Ceremonies like the Phariſees waſhing, the outſide, while they devoure the Eſtates of other men without remorſe, are they not Phariſees? and are they only, that profeſſe they cannot ſwallow ſuch Camells Phariſees? this is a new found Phariſee.

The three Realmes all moſt periſhed for want of Parliaments. Wee have ſeene how neere periſhing they are by a Parliament, which hath committed more Injuſtice ſince it began, then all our ſtories have remembred for five hundred yeares before.

The Libeller hath found out a new kinde of ſacriledge, for he endures not to have Church robbing called ſacriledge, and that is *to bereave a Chriſtian conſcience of libertie for the narrownes of his owne conſcience.* And by what Engine is this ſacriledge committed, doth he, that abſtaines for conſcience ſake bereave another mans conſcienc of libertie?

He

He thinkes *to take away ſuperfluous wealth from the Clergie is not ſacriledge* for that ſerves, as an excuſe for their theft in taking from others what they pretend ill vſed,& wee may ſee the love theſe Sectaries have vnto the goods of the Church, that extenuate their impietie by pretending, that ſuch men moſt oppoſe that wickednes, *whoſe righteouſnes, in other matters hath been leaſt obſerved.* And theſe are noe Phariſees,that traduce the oppoſers of their ſacriledge for want of righteouſnes in other matters, this is their new righteouſnes, that allowes none holy, but their owne gang, and nothing vnholy, that they practiſe, and therefore they will not ſee the Kings vertues, leaſt they be driven to confeſſe their owne wicked Actions againſt him.

Vpon the

REBELLION

IN

IRELAND.

IT Could not poſſibly be ſoe ſecrett from whence it ſprung, as the contriver ſuppoſed. And if he knew the contrivers, perhaps he might know,whether they ſuppoſed it would be ſecrett,for they that pretended to be the principall contrivers avowed it openly.

It cannot be imaginable, that the Iriſh guided by ſoe many ſubtill, and Italian heads ſhould ſoe farr have loſt the vſe of reaſon, and Common ſenſe, as not ſupported by other ſtrength then their owne,to begin a warr ſoe deſperate againſt England, and Scotland. And truly it may ſeeme,that they,who thought themſelves wiſer then Italian heads had loſt reaſon, & Common ſenſe, who letting loſe,or rather cutting aſunder theReynes of Government, which held in that kingdome to a people naturally diſaffected to thoſe, vnto whome they were ſubject, invited them to that Rebellion, firſt in a popular fury cutting of the Ld. Lieutenant, to gratifie them,& then leaving the Kingdome without a ſucceſſour, and preparing the way to a Civill warr in England, ſtirring vp jealoſies againſt the King, and weakning his Authoritie, and compoſing Apologies for Rebellion, which would ſerve the Iriſhe pretences, aſwell as the diferences in England their deſignes,and thoſe Italian heads ſaw as much advantage from our broyles,as want of aide from *other nations,who were buſied to the*

vtmoſt in their owne moſt neceſſary concernements; And therefore the libeller vainely inferrs authoritie *for aſſiſtance promiſed from England*, vnles it were from the faction in the houſes, there being noe viſible ſtrength then in any other,& there neede not,nor could be any private aſſurance vnto the Iriſh Rebells from any other, but that faction, and it is moſt apparent,that they neglected all meanes to remedie that miſcheife,buſying themſelves wholy in laying the ground worke of the Rebellion inEngland,which they held their moſt neceſſary concernement,& this was ground enough for Italian heads to ſtirr vp that Rebellion.

The libeller proceedes vpon his ſuppoſitions,as if they were graunted truths,& he would inſinnate *an equivocation* in what the King ſayes, *That the ſea of blood is enough to drowne any man ineternall both infamy, and miſerie, whome God ſhall finde the malitious Author, or inſtigatour of that effuſion.* Becauſe he ſayes *the Rebells themſelves wil not confeſſe,that any blood was ſhed by them maliciouſly, but for the Catholique cauſe, or Common libertie.* Therein they differ not from the Libeller, and his Engliſh Rebells, for they wil not confeſſe any of the blood they ſhed to be maliciouſly, but for Religion, and Common libertie,and thence the Libeller learnes his ſkill to caſt ſuſpitions vpon the plaineſt expreſſions of others,he well deſcerned,that the King vſed the word malicious for aggravation, not reſtriction,& his obſervation was captious,when he read in the following Period, that the King affirmes, *nothing could be more abhorred of him being ſoe full of ſin againſt God,diſloyaltie to himſelfe,and deſtructive to his ſubjects,*and calls God to wittnes,*that as he could with truth waſh his hands in innocencie,as to any guilt in that Rebellion,ſoe he might waſh them in his teares,as to the ſadd apprehenſion he had to ſee it ſpredd ſo far,& make ſuch waſte.* And the Libeller himſelfe after ſoe impertinent,and malitious an inſinuation confeſſes he denies, it both heere, and elswhere.

But he ſayes *there is in it no ſuch wide diſagreemēt from the ſcope of his former Counſells*, we are ſure there could not be agreement with the ſcope of his former Counſells. It was agreeable to the Counſells of Rebells to defame theKing with this aſperſion,& it is not ſtrange,that vntruths may be affirmed *in three Kingdomes* in reguard of the contrivers,that ſoe induſtriouſly ſpred them. But let vs heare his reaſons or reports. *Its moſt certaine, that the King was ever friendly to the Iriſh Papiſts.* And its certaine, that what he ſayes is falſe, but whats that to their Rebellion againſt himſelfe, or deſtroying his Kingdome?

But his certaintie is, that the King *in his third yeare againſt the plaine advice of Parliament, like a kinde of Pope ſold them many indulgences for money.* And was he a kinde of Pope to take their penalties of them,which the law enacted for their recuſancy, was that Pope like? That the King might not receive the penalties, which the law gave him, or take compoſitions, where the whole could not be had was never againſt the advice of Parliament, but this is a very long ſtride from his third yeare

yeare to the beginning of the Rebellion, but how does he hang this togeather.

The advancing the Popiſh partie he ſayes, but inſtances in noe particular, nor for *negotiating vnderhand by Prieſts*, which were as impertinent to an inference of the Kings friend-ſhip, or cauſing the Rebellion, as the vſe of ſuch perſons by Miniſters of State, though of different Religion.

He engaged the Iriſh Papiſts in a warr againſt the Scotch proteſtants, there was never popiſh engagement againſt the Scotts for the King, if in the kings Army rayſed in that kingdome, there were Papiſts, it was without the engagement of their partie, but their engagement by alleagiance to their King, and whence doth it follow, that becauſe the King rayſed an Army in Ireland he muſt therefore rayſe the Rebellion in Ireland? and as its well knowne, that the keeping vp of that Army would probably have prevented the Rebellion of Ireland, & that it was diſbanded long before that Rebelliõ brake foorth; ſo they, which complained ſo much of that Army, and importuned to have it disbanded, thereby prepared the way to their owne Rebellion as groundleſſe, and cruell, as that of the Iriſh.

The ſummer before that diſmall October a Committee of active Papiſts, all ſince in the head of the Rebelliõ, (yet Sr. Hardreſſe waller was one of them) *were in greate favour at whitehall, and admitted to private conſultations of the King, and Queene.* Then all Companies of Traytours are Committees from the example of the late Parliament. But he was loath to ſay, they were a Committee (as they were) from the lower houſe of Parliament in Ireland, which kept correſpondence with the faction of the Engliſh Parliament, and made addreſſes to them, and were encouraged by them in their proceedings with the King, and their comming over was wholy to ſerve the deſigne of the faction in England.

But noe meane matters were the ſubject of theſe conferences, for he gave away his peculiar right to more then five Iriſh Counties for an inconſiderable Rent. But it was not his right of ſoveraigntie, neither was this, which he calls noe meane matter a conference about the Rebellion, and this peculiar right, which this Libeller accuſes the King for parting with not to Papiſts peculiarly, but ſubjects in generall, the accuſers of the Earle of Strafford charged him for aſſerting to the King, and that inconſiderable Rent was in their judgment exceſſive, theſe are the colours of Juſtice, and truth, which theſe Rebells put on their Calumnies.

They departed not till within two moneths before the Rebellion. Rebells ordinarly diſguiſe their intentions, and therefore ſuch might frequent the Court, as the faction in Parliament pretended affection, and dutie, while they plotted to deſtroy the King, and now the Libeller reſorts to his Scotch Author, who he ſayes declares. *What ſhould move the King to thoſe cloſe meetings*, he, that beleives Sanders, Carries, and other Papiſts

in their virulent forgeries againſt Queene Elizabeth, may likely give credit to the Libeller, and his friend the Scotchman, and take vp infamous Libells for true ſtories.

The Libeller flies from hence to one of his common haunts, *the deſigne of bringing vp the Engliſh, and Scotch Army*, and thinkes it noe repetition, which he had ſoe often obtruded, and he inferrs, that becauſe *the King could not prevayle with them*, he *betakes himſelfe to the Iriſh, who had in readines an Army of eight thouſand Papiſts, and a Committee heere of the ſame Religion.* But what to doe to kill one another? If the King ſought to make vſe of the Iriſh, that rebelled, he might more advantagiouſly have done it, then by cutting one anothers throates, and had they intended him aſſiſtance, they would not have conſumed themſelves againſt his ſubjects there, and how could he tranſport that Army from Ireland, that was diſbanded before ever the Rebellion brake foorth, and the Committee departed two moneths before.

He tells vs from his friend the Scotchman, that *there were they, who thought now was the time to doe ſervice for the Church of Rome againſt the Puritant Parliament.* Its very likely there were they, who thought the Puritan faction in Parliament had done more to the advantage of the Church of Rome by the embroyling of England, then ever had been done ſince the reformation, and they might well thinke it a fit time to attempt any deſigne againſt the Kingdome. And did not the Libeller thinke, that there are among the vulgar ſuch capacities, as receive legends, and Romanſes for true ſtories, he would not ſoe groſſely produce ſuch diſcourſes of *five Counties* given to the Iriſh, and *fower offred to the Scotch*, And of like ſtuffe is his mention of the Kings attempt to *pervert the Scotch Army from their way homeward, and the plot*, which he hath taken from his Scotch Colleague *to remove out of the way ſuch, as were moſt likely to withſtand, or not further his deſignes.* With this libertie of invention doe theis Traytours ſeeke to maſke their villany

That a Commiſſion vnder the greate ſeale of Scotland commaunded this Rebellion. Was taken vp after the pretence of the greate ſeale of England was detected of falſitie, and as this greate ſeale of Scotland hath aſmuch vntruth, ſoe it hath noe more colour, there being noe poſſibilitie for the King to vſe that ſeale, not at all in his power to ſuch a Commiſſion.

The ſending of the Ld. Dillon is of the ſame ſtampe, what the Iriſh did is eaſily graunted, but the falſhoods of this Libeller, and his friend the ſcotchman are no miſteries of iniquitie, but open, and detected cheates, & one quotes the authoritie of the other, as if they were ſtrangers mett by chance, and make Libelling their worke to diſtract the people, and yet from theſe devices the Libeller will conclude, that *the King cannot be doubted to be Author, or inſtigatour of that Rebellion.* It had been ridiculous to cite a gazett, but a branded ſtigmaticke, infamous. If his reaſon be moved by ſuch Arguments, tis the leſſe wonder, that his language,

güage, and practice is soe corrupt, and he may reckon himselfe among that rabble of the vulgar, he soe much despises.

These Testimonies likelyhoods, evidences, and apparent Actions, which he mentions in the declaration of July 1643. Are of as litle credit, as his friend the Scotchman. And there is not a more evident conviction of malefactours, then their declarations against the king are of the guilt of those, that contrived them, setting foorth their dutie, which they dissembled, and condemning their actions, which they disavowed.

It is not credible, that the Irish Rebells would be soe farr from humanitie, as to slander him being soe well received by him at Oxford. If a man had wanted an proofe of the Libellers absurditie, he might heere be furnished by himselfe, that drawes an Argument from the humanitie of the Irish, whose barbaritie, and Treacherie is soe greate a part of his accusation against the king. They who were received at Oxford vpon offer of submission, were very farr from pretence of such a Commission, and it may be aswell concluded they had a Commission at Oxford, as before, because they were there, and aswell concluded, that they never Rebelled, as that they made noe salfe pretences of their Rebellion.

The king neede not bring proofes against a groundles accusation, that containes not any evidence of fact, and a single denyall by al lawes is preferred before such a charge, and it is as likely, that the Rebells in Ireland should pretend his Seale, as those in England his authoritie, & noe man doubts of the invaliditie of a Rebells pretence.

This Chapter is not without witnes of his good affection to the Rebells, which he collects from that the king sayes, *they were lesse in fault, then the Scotts, from whome they might alledge to have fetched their imitation, making no difference*, sayes the Libeller, *betweene men, that rose necessarily to defend themselves, which noe Protestant Doctrine ever disallowed against them, who threatned warr, and those who began a voluntary, & causeles Rebellion.* If the Irish made warr not to be restrained from their Religion, had they not the same cause, & the same pretence of defending themselves, as the other pretended for refusing the Common prayer booke, and expelling Bishopps? Where lies the odds? Is it Protestant Doctrine, that they may defend themselves, and Papists may not, and that Protestants may Rebell for Religion, Papists may not? That were very much to the credit of Religion, but the Libeller will not acknowledge the protestants, nor their Doctrine, who maintaine it to be vnlawful for subjects to defend themselves against the supreame power, though Tyranically abused, and there is noe neede to fly to the Parliaments authoritie, if subjects may take Armes against their king vpon pretence of defending theinselves.

The Libeller well knowes the just indignation the Protestants abroade have expressed for this scandall, the king names not the Scotts, but thinkes, that their blame must needes be greater, whose Actions

the

the Iriſh had to alledge for their imitation, *by how much proteſtant principles are more againſt Rebellion, then thoſe of Papiſts* ſuch, as inferre good affection to the Iriſh from ſuch premiſes will eaſily make vaine, or malitious rumours ſtrong proofes.

The King ſayes, *he hath the greateſt ſhare of diſhonour, and loſſe, by what is committed.* The Libeller, as before makes this noe Argument, becauſe *every one, that offends God, or his neighbour hath the greateſt ſhare of loſſe. and diſhonour in the end*, and have they not worldly ends, in offending God, and if theſe ends were not ſought by them, they would not offend God?

He pretended before, that *this was a politique contrivance of the King*, and now he would have it *an act without deſigne.* Doth he thinke, that the malitious reports of him, and his Scotchman are of weight to make a man ſuſpected of an act directly tending to his owne vndoing, and would the King inſtigate the Iriſh Rebellion for his owne ends to have the aſſiſtance of the Iriſh, which by ſuch engagement could not aſſiſt him. Though preſumptions are noe convincing proofes, yet they are more credible, then ſuſpitions, or reports. It is a ſtrong Argument for the peoples confidence in their King more then in other men, becauſe his intereſt lies cheifely in the common welfare of his ſubjects, and it is hard to beleive, that a King will knowingly doe any thing againſt that intereſt, and to his owne loſſe, and diſhonour, and whenever any have offended in that kinde, the proofe of it hath been more apparent, then the authoritie of rumours, and Libells, but heere the act it ſelfe cannot have any poſſibilitie of concurrence to the Kings ends.

It too notoriouſly appeares in another ſection, which he Mangles, but ſhall heere have it whole. The King ſayes, *tis thought by many wiſe men, that the prepoſterous rigour, and vnreaſonable ſeveritie, which ſome men carryed before them in England was not the leaſt incentive, that kindled, and blew vp into thoſe horrid flames the ſparkes of diſcontent, which wanted not prediſpoſed fewell for Rebellion in Ireland.* The Libeller ſayes that *theſe ſome men are the Parliament. And if the Rebells had feed an Advocate, he could hardly have dazled better.* Truly the Libellers too notoriouſly doth not amount to a dazling of any eyes from deſcerning his vaine confidence. Does any thing heerein excuſe a Rebellion, that ſpeakes only of what ſucceded it? And if the kings cenſure of the proceedings of ſuch, as managed the buſines againſt the Rebells, ſhew an affection to the Rebells then certainely moſt Princes, that have had warrs in Ireland were very guiltie of that affection, that vſed like cenſures, but what the king ſayes heere was ſpoken in Parliament by diverſe members, who diſadviſed the prepoſterous ſeveritie, that was propounded, and afterward proceeded in, and it will reſt an indelible blemiſh of a raſh, and vnadviſed Councell in thoſe men, that in the beginning of a Rebellion

bellion would put a whole nation into deſpaire, and feare of extirpation.

That *their wonted oppreſſions*, as they conceived *ſhould rather have made them againſt the King, then the Parliament* is eaſily beleived, for its knowne to all the world they did riſe againſt the king vpon pretence of regaining their nationall liberties from the Engliſh oppreſſion, as they called it, and ſince the Libeller ſeeth ſoe apparent an Argument of their riſing againſt the king, its blinde madnes to ſuſpect their riſing for the king. The Parliament then pretended to act for the king, and that the Rebellion was againſt him, not themſelves, but the man deſerts his Arguments, and falls to his old common place, and will ſuſpect the king, becauſe *he vſed the Prelaticall Religion, and to force it vpon others made Epiſcopall, Ceremoniall, and common prayer booke warrs.* Such men, as made warrs, and rayſed Rebellion to take away the order of Biſhopps, Ceremonies, and booke of Common prayer eſtabliſhed by lawes in the Raignes of beſt Princes with the advice of the moſt eminent confeſſours, and Martyrs of the age, wherein they lived conformable to the Scripture, and pureſt times of the Church, declare to the whole world, that they have neither ſhame, truth, nor Religion, and are juſtly ſtigmatized for making not only Epiſcopall, Ceremoniall, and common prayer booke warrs, but Antichriſtian, and Diabolicall Rebellion.

That the Papiſts knew *theſe warrs were their warrs* may eaſily be beleived, for they muſt needes apprehend advantage from the Rebellion But its well knowne, that the Papiſts are more jealous of Epiſcopacie, Ceremonies, and booke of common prayer, as they ſtand reformed in the Church of England, then of the Directory, Extemporall devotions, independent, or Preſbiterall platformes, that have noe foundation in the Scripture, or the doctrine, or practice of the ancient Church, but what is this to the prepoſterous rigour, and vncharitable fury, that he would juſtifie? Does he meane, that the extirpation of the Iriſh was the ſole way to ſuppreſſe open Idolatry, and is this *what we may doe Evangecally to be their Reformers?* Is blood, & maſſacre Evangelicall reformation, & is kill, and reforme the ſame thinge? As that rigour obſerved by his Majeſt: was altogeather vnpolitique, ſoe if it were intended in order to Religion, it was moſt abominable, ſuch Maſſacres being the deſignes of irreligious perſecutours, not Evangelicall Reformers, who though they *feare* not their adverſaries, yet will not give them cauſe of ſcandall, nor deſperation, and ſuch, as make deſtruction their Reformation, ſhew they feare men, whome they ſeeke to kill, not God, whome preſumptuouſly, and hipocritically they pretend to ſerve.

His inſtance of King James is as impertinent, as ſcurrilous, that *after the powder plot King Iames durſt never doe other, then equivoiate, and*

collegue with the Pope,& his adherents. Doth this viper beleive,the Pope, or his adherents had any ſuch thoughts? Was the writing againſt the the Pope a Colloguinge? The many invectives of Popiſh writers againſt him ſignifie the plaine contrary; beſides the lawes made by him againſt Popiſh recuſants ſhew,that the Author was in one of his lunatique tranſes,when he dreamt of that *heckticke trembling.*

The retarding,and delayes of releife to Ireland againſt that Rebellion, were ſoe apparently diſcovered to proceede from the faction in Parliament, that there reſts not the leaſt colour to charge it vpon the King. They converted the ſubjects money,and other preparations for the releife of Ireland to the rayſing of the Rebellion in England, and they hindred the going over of a new governour into that kingdome, becauſe they would vſe his helpe to their deſignes at home.

They were diffident to truſt the King with an army,and therefore refuſed his offer to goe in perſon againſt the Rebells. It ſeemes they had litle compaſſion on that people, that preferred their jealoſies before their pittie,& it is a plaine Treaſon,and encouragement to that Rebellion to pretend diſtruſt of their King, and ſhewes they ſought their owne perſonall ſecuritie before the remedie of that Rebellion,& the ſafetie of the kingdome. His Majeſt: might juſtly finde fault with thoſe, who threatned all extreamitie to the Rebells,and they, that exclude all mercy to every ſingle perſon, where multitudes are involved, and ſuch,as followed Abſolom with a ſimple heart, ſhew neither humanitie,nor Chriſtianitie, when *Fathers Brothers, Wives, and Children were deſtroyed by ſuch an occaſion,* neither is *Magiſtracie, and warr vnder the goſpell* giuded by ſuch paſſions,but by the rules of Chriſtian pittie,and ſuch as give themſelves the licence of vniverſall Maſſacres, will not abſtaine from embruing their hands in the blood of their Fathers, Brothers, Wives, and Children, ſparing neither ancient, nor ſuckling, King, nor Prieſt, defacing, all Monuments of Chriſtianitie,and turning Religion into the diſcourſes of their hirelings, and all devotion into ſquint eyes, and diſfigured faces, and erect an Empire in themſelves with the ſlaughter of all, that ſubmitt not to them.

The repetition of *making the warr* by the King in England,is his Catholicon againſt all exceptions, and *Gewgawes of the Crowne, and Copes, and ſurpliſſes, and ſuch trinketts,* he thinkes are names to ſublimate his braine ſicke Sectaries into their frenetique fitt, and make them cry out greate are the Calves of their vnknowne Religion, whither they contemne the wiſedome of God vnder the law,& his mercy vnder the goſpel, and will rather wade through the blood of their Country, then endure power in the King, or decencie in the Church.

There is greate difference betweene the inſtances of the deſtruction of the ſichemites,and the diſciples calling, for fire from heaven againſt the Citie, that denyed lodging,and this of a nation by juſt warr, & execution to ſlay whole fame-

lies

lies of them, who had ſlaine whole families before. But where lies the odds, there was aſmuch threatned to the Irish, as was done to the ſichemites? Though there were a difference betweene the ſins of ſome, there was noe difference betweene the innocence of many, and there is noe difference betweene them, that will deſtroy promiſcuouſly without mercy, where all are not guiltie in the one caſe, and the other. But why doth not the Libeller ſtate his caſe right, and inſteede of families ſett downe the whole nation, as the truth was? Did he ſhrinke at the expreſſion of the truth at large, and name families to diminiſh the guilt?

That, which *was done againſt the Benjamites*, was by Gods revealed will in that particular Caſe, and yet there was a remnant reſerved of them, that eſcaped the preſent ſtroake of the warr, and they returned againe to their poſſeſſions.

The Libeller ſayes, *he ſpeakes not this, that ſuch meaſure ſhould be meated to all the Iriſh, or as remembring, that the Parliament ever ſoe decreed.* But if they did ſoe, then this ſhall ſerve for their juſtification, for to what end els is it, that he offers excuſes?

To ſhew, that this homily, (meaning it ſeemes the Kings diſcourſe) *hath more of craft, and affectation, then ſound doctrine.* But either it is ſound doctrine, or elſe the Libeller muſt juſtifie the contrary, to which he ſayes that which he ſpeakes is not intended, and that, which he hath brought ſhewes, that the homily he intends is ſound Doctrine, and his intended oppoſition ſignifies nothing, but his owne corruption.

The King would have ſome puniſhed, which he ſayes *were of leaſt vſe, and muſt of neceſſitie have been ſacrifiſed to his reputation.* And can he thinke, that the king cauſed the Rebellion, and yet would puniſh any for his reputation, might they not then produce it? and how then could he ſacrifiſe them to his reputation, which would be more wounded by the puniſhing of one, then the ſparing of all.

The king ſayes, *ſome were to be pretected vpon their ſubmiſſion from the fury of thoſe, who would ſoone drowne them, if they refuſed to ſwim downe the popular ſtreame with them.* The Libeller ſayes *that fury is applyed to the Parliament.* If ſuch were their condition, its not miſapplyed.

The Libeller ſayes, *he remembers not they had ſoe decreed,* & if not, how could it be applyed to them? And wherefore doth he except to the ſoundnes of the doctrine, if it concerned them not?

Thoſe, who would not ſwim downe the ſtreame *are Papiſts, Prelates, and their faction.* He meanes not Engliſh Prelates, for they have not yet been charged with the Iriſh Rebellion, and if he meane the Romiſh Prelates, it were ſuperfluous, having named Papiſts before, and why doth he ſay, that he ſpeakes not, that ſuch meaſure ſhould be meated to all the Iriſh, when he would have the king eſteemed a favourer of the Iriſh Rebellion, if he protected any Iriſh Papiſts vpon their ſubmiſſion? For he ſayes, *by this, who ſees not, that he, and the Iriſh Rebells had but*

one aime. And whoever thinkes he ſees it by this hath neither ſight, nor reaſon, and there is nothing to be ſeene in the Libellers inference, but exceſſive impudence, and falſhood.

The King ſayes, *ſome kinde of zeale is not ſeldome more greedy to kill the Beare for his ſkin, then for any harme he hath done.* This the Libeller renders *our zeale*, and would inferre from thence, *that the Parliament is more bloody in the proſecution of their Iuſtice, then the Rebells in their cruelty.* And by what conſtruction can he make that good? may there not be by ends in a judge, & yet his ſentence not ſoe bloody, as a malefactours Cryme, & he, that charges a Magiſtrate with a wrong end in giving a Juſt ſentence, doth not diminiſh the Cryme of the malefactour. Can any rationall ſoule conclude vpon the Kings diſlike of irregular proceedings againſt the Iriſh, that he excuſed their Cryme? This is chaffe to caſt in the eyes of his bleerde Sectaries, for none elſe are ſoe purblinde, and there needs noe diſpute, that the King perfectly hated the Iriſh Rebellion, & juſtly cenſured the proceeding in that vnſeaſonable threatning of deſtruction. The inſtance of the beares ſkin was made by a member of the lower houſe at the time, when they debated that buſines, and yet they then thought it noe favour to the Iriſh, nor cenſure of their owne proceedings.

The ceſſation, which the King made was in favour of the Iriſh, and without the advice of Parliament, to whome he had committed the managing of that warr. The King plainely deſcerned, that the deſigne of the faction in Parliament in managing the Iriſh warrs was only to draw money from the people vnder that pretence to ſubdue England, and deſtroy him by taking away al aſſiſtance from him, and thence proceedes their Calumnie vpon the ceſſation; and their willfull neglect, and diverſion of ſuccours amidſt the reiterated Cryes of the proteſtants in that Kingdome, the importunitie of the Lords Juſtices, and the viſible growth of the Enemy ſhewes the advantage they made of that Rebellion, & the King was bound in Juſtice, and honour to preſerve that Kingdome, and in Chriſtian pittie to releive his diſtreſſed ſubjects, which he could not doe without reſuminge the managing of that warr, which had been ſoe Treacherouſly miſcarried by thoſe he truſted, & as he made that ceſſation by the advice, & intreatie of his proteſtant ſubjects there, ſoe they were ſufficient wittneſſes of the low condition themſelves were in, and the power of the Rebells.

But the Libeller would prove, that *the Proteſtants there were on the winning hand*, becauſe *they kept their owne notwithſtanding the miſſe of thoſe forces, which were landed in wales, and Cheſhire, who without difficultie Maſtered a greate part of theſe Countreyes.* The Proteſtants keeping of their owne was by the benifitt of that ceſſation, without which they hoped not to keepe it, and thoſe Countreyes of wales, and Cheſhire were not maſtered by thoſe forces, as the Libeller ſuppoſes, but protected

ted by them againſt the Tyrany of the Rebellion then ontring vpon them.

The *Declaration*, which he vouches for proofe is an infamy to the Authors, conteyning neither colour of proofe, nor ſoundnes of Argument, and of as litle creditt, as his owne aſſertions. In the meane time thoſe forces of the Proteſtants, which the king gott by that ceſſation declare to the world, that the Iriſh Rebellion croſſed his ends, and advanced thoſe of the Engliſh Rebells.

The way-laying of proviſions was contradicted by ſuch apparent proofes in his Majeſt: anſweares, that vntill they make ſome reply to thoſe particulars, their clamours will ſignifie nothing but want of matter.

The forces he called over ſtood him in noe ſmall ſteede againſt our maine forces. That noe way hinders, but that they might be termed *handfulls* in reſpect of the numerous Rebells both in Ireland, & England. The reaſons of the ceſſation, beſides the knowne evidence of truth, and weight have an addition of Authoritie from the Libellers calling them falſe, and frivolous without the leaſt ſhew of reaſon, it being his cuſtome to ſtile truth, and reaſon by ſuch Titles.

He reprehends the king *for likening his puniſhments to Iobs Tryalls, before he ſaw them have Iobs endings.* And vpon the ſame reaſon he will not allow the Tryalls of the Martirs to have a likenes to Jobs, becauſe the end in reſpect of Temporall felicitie was not the ſame.

The king ſayes, he hath not *leiſure to make prolix Apologies*, from whence the libeller concludes *thoſe long declarations, and Remonſtrances*, which he calls *Pamphletts ſet out in his name were none of his.* And is not this a tidy inference, becauſe the king in priſon expecting the execution of the cruell deſignes of the Traytours had noe leiſure to make prolix Apologies, therefore the declarations, and Remonſtrances publiſhed by him, while he was at libertie were none of his. The king hath given ſufficient Teſtimony to ſtopp the mouth af a deſtractour, that noe writings, publiſhed in his name were above his abilitie. If his declarations were weightie, and juſt, why are they Pamphletts? if not why, will not the Libeller believe him the Author whome he ſeeks to vilifie, but the world knowes the declarations in the name of Parliament were none of theirs, but voted vpon the word of a junto by ſuch as had not capacitie, to vnderſtand them.

That *though the Common ſaying, that it is Kingly to doe well, and heare ill be ſometimes true, yet more frequently to doe ill, and heare well by the multitude of flatterers, that deifie the name of Kings.* It can hardly be proved, that ever evill king had ſoe many flatterers, as the beſt kings have detractours, and himſelfe produces inſtances, how the multitude deified Simon Mountford, and ſuch popular brovillions againſt their kings.

For *the peace in Ireland*, the Juſtice of it is now apparent, and he, that pardons Rebells to ſave the effuſion of the blood of his good ſubjects, ſhewes greater tendernes to the good, then they, that by endeavouring to exclude all from mercy, expoſe them promiſcuouſly to mutuall ſlaughter, and may juſtly be judged to looke vpón both with an indifferent eye, and that neither Juſtice, nor pittie, but greedy, and rapacious deſires carry them to that crueltie.

The King prayes at large for the Iriſh Rebells. It ſeemes Charitie for Enemies is held a ſin by theſe miſcreants, otherwiſe he would not have cenſured a prayer ſoe becoming a Chriſtian, that God would not give over *the whole ſtocke of that ſeduced nation to the wrath of thoſe, whoſe covetuouſnes makes them cruell, nor to their anger, which is too feirce, and therefore juſtly curſed.* The King deprecates the Rebellion of Ireland, and in his prayer concludes his innocence, and that if he had not ſtudied the compoſing of the differences ſayes, *let thy hand be vpon me, & my fathers houſe.* And this the Libeller calls a ſolemne Curſe, which is his judgment of the Cryme, and the aſſertion of his innocence. Though God afflict his ſervants, his hand is not againſt them in wrath, as this wretch preſumes to ſay, and lookes not on that curſe, which God denounces againſt bloody, and deceitefull men, that pretend his ſervice in the deſtruction of his ſervants.

Vpon the calling in of the

SCOTTS,

and their

COMMINGE.

HE, that obſerves how greate a part of this Libellers booke his invectives againſt Monarchy take vp, & how frequently, and impertinently he offers his exceptions againſt Kingly Government in excuſe of falſhood, and Rebellion, may well wonder at his exceptions to pretended repetitions, in the Kings booke he enters vpon this Chapter with his opinion of the originall of Kings *to be ſervants of the publique.* And yet the people were ſubjects to them, and how farr Kings miſtake the nature of their office, *that thinke they are Maſters of the people.* And yet God gave nations to ſerve

ſerve them. Though their power is for publique good, yet they have a peculiar proprietie in that power, and Eſtate, as private men in their private fortunes, & its more for the peoples good to be ſubject, though to an evill King, then to fall to confuſion. And if rulers may not retaine their power, becauſe factious multitudes ſay, that they are but intruſted for the peoples good, & that it is for the peoples good, that they yeilde vp the ſword, they bare it in vaine. Such a wooden ſword have the Rebells provided for all Rulers, but themſelves, for when they get power by their ſwords of ſteele, or mines of powder the people may not thinke, that they ſhall finde ſuch Lords of ſtraw, as they pretend governours of the people ought to be. We are taught by Scripture, that the people are commaunded to hearken, and obey, not teach, & commaund, and though his ſuppoſition, that Government is in the people, and that they ordained Kings be vaine, and falſe by the examples of Scripture, and of moſt Authenticke hiſtories, yet were it admitted, that a King came in by the peoples conſent, they are not after ſuch ſubmiſſion Judges of their owne obedience, or their Kings power.

It were vaine to follow the Libeller in his exceptions to *the words of favour, and gratification, as ſounding pride, and Lordly vſurpation*, as if kings only had nothing in their power to oblidge men with all, theſe are the ſpleenetique vapours of Rebellious diſtemper.

For the *Kings conceſſions to the Scotts*, *either* touching *Epiſcopacie*, or the *Militia*, wee ſhall heare his anſweare in due time, howſoever the king was not bound to the ſame Actions, where Circumſtances varied, nor after a fuller vnderſtanding of the nature, and conſequence of the things graunted, and as his Majeſt: profeſſed a cleerer information after theſe Actions had paſſed him, ſoe he evidently ſaw, that they were more againſt his ſubjects good, then his owne, and that inſteede of preventing an Arbitrary power, it would have introduced an arbitrary licence, and confuſion into the Kingdome, and ſuch men, as preferre the bondage of popular confuſion, or the licentious inſolence of many Lords, are eyther inchanted with a witch craft of Rebellion, or ſtupidly benummed with a ſenſeles Lethargy.

With what Zeale the Libeller reproves the abuſe of Scripture, when he exclaimes, as if it offended his conſcience, we may perceive by the alluſion he makes ſaying. *Ireland was as Ephraim, the ſtrength of his head*, meaning the Kings, *Scotland, as Iudah was his law giver, but over England, as over Edom he meant to caſt his ſhooe.* Hath this man reverence to Scripture, or the Author of it?

He comes againe to accuſe the King for perſecuting *the conſciences of Religious men*, a knowne vntruth, yet ſoe much beloved by the Libeller, as he ſeemes impatient to miſſe the repetition of it, and with this he joynes his reproving the Kings profeſſion *of being an Enemy of thoſe, that forced the conſcience* becauſe *he had made a warr, and loſt all, rather then not*

vphold

vphold the Biſhopps. It is an Argument, that he eſteemed his conſcience, that loſt all for it. But the Libeller ſayes, they were *perſecuting Biſhopps.* The King vpholding Biſhopps, vpholds not perſecution, or abuſe, and the Libellers confounding the office, & ill exerciſe of it makes knowne his want of Argument. The falſhood of their Calumnies againſt the Biſhopps is ſufficiently manifeſted to the world, that after ſoe many vehement outcryes they have not proved on ſuch act of perſecution done by any one of them, & not the preſons but the office, & lawe were the perſecution in this mans judgment.

The King obtruded new Ceremonies vpon vs, vpon the Scotts a new Liturgie There were noe new Ceremonies obtruded by him in England, and this horrid Rebellion to take away the Ceremonies, and Government legally eſtabliſhed, and continually practiſed, vnder the name of innovations, detects both the fraude, and outrage of their proceedings. The new leiturgie offred the Scots by advice of their Biſhopps, and Clergie, was an act befitting the care of a King, and noe man will beleive, that it was an offence te their conſciences, who made noe conſcience of blood, and Rebellion vpon pretence of their conſcience, which the world ſees was an hipocriticall ſtraining at a ſtraw, and ſwallowing a Camell, and theſe tender conſcience men have written their tendernes of conſcience with the blood of their brethren; which will remaine a memoriall of their diſſembled ſanctitie.

What *hinderance of the ſearch of truth,* he meanes is not vnderſtood, vnles he would have the dreames of mad ſectaries confirmed by authoritie.

He would have the penalties of lawes thought perſecution of the conſcience, and ſectaries the Judges, and ſayes, *if himſelfe* (meaning the King) *and his learned Churchmen were the obſtinate part, ſhould Reformation ſuffer them to ſit Lording like the greate whore?* And are ſectaries Libells convictions of Kings, and learned Churchmen, and the clamours of malefactours a ſentence againſt the Judge? Such is the Government, that muſt now rule the world, and Reformation muſt be an Idoll in the hands of a ſeditious ſectarie, whereto the people muſt fall downe, and ſuch vnſtable multitudes carried about with every winde of doctrine are likely to be thoſe many waters, on which the greate whore ſits, which hath for corruption, and crueltie a greate reſemblance vnto thoſe falſe prophetts, that now ſeduce the people.

Theſe Clergimen were not to bedriven like ſheepe, but driven out like wolves. But they are theeves, and wolves, that enter into the ſheepefold by violence, and ſtealth, and the ambition, and greedines of theſe wolves will finde occaſion to ſucke the blood, and devoure the fleſh of the ſheepe.

The king ſayes, *that he beleives the Preſbiterie, though proved to be the only inſtitution of Ieſus Chriſt, were not by the ſword to be ſet vp without his conſent, which is contrary* ſaith the Libeller, *both to the doctrine, and knowne practic*

practice of all Proteſtant Churches, if his ſword threaten thoſe, who of their owne accord imbrace it. But then it, cannot be ſett vp by the ſword, vnles his ſword threaten thoſe, that imbrace it; And this jugler denies, what the king ſayes, and yet in effect profeſſes it, and while he enrages the Tumults to ſett vp their Preſbiterie with the ſword produces Arguments only for defence. The reformed Churches profeſſe to follow the ancients in ſuffering, not aſſociate themſelves to bloody Sectaries in Rebelling. And his next words impert that private men may not contend with Magiſtrates, nor vſe force againſt them.

Though Chriſt, and his Apoſtles being to Civill affaires but private men contended not with Magiſtrates, yet when Magiſtrates themſelves, and eſpecially Parliament come to know Religion, they ought to defend it againſt any King, or Tyrant. What is defence to the queſtion in hand of ſetting vp Religion by the ſword without the kings conſent? May an inferiour Chriſtian Magiſtrate take Armes againſt his ſuperiour a Pagan to ſett vp Religion. Is he not as much a private man as our Saviour, and his Apoſtles, where the Civill power hath not given him a right? And as a Civill right is not imaginable, ſoe the pretence of a power from Religion is execrable, and falſe which will not permitt an vſurpation vpon the Civill right. There may be a King, where there is noe Parliament, and it is noe more lawfull for an inferiour Migiſtrate, or to Parliament, who are but private men in regard of the Prince, whoſe deputies they are to take the ſword to ſett vp Religion againſt the King their ſoveraigne, then for any private men, and were not the libeller diſtracted betweene evidence of truth, and his owne corrupt inclinations, he would not inſtance in the name of Magiſtrates, and Parliament, that but the line before pretended the power of *the people to* doe the ſame thing by the doctrine, and practice of all Proteſtant Churches, and would make them more publique perſons, then their Saviour, and his Apoſtles, he thinkes his reviling language of *Tyrany*, and *bloody Biſhopps*, and the *King their pupill* are irrefragable Arguments in the judgment of his pupills.

There is a large difference betweene forcing men by the ſword to turne Preſbiterians, and defending them, who willingly are ſoe. But then it is impious to force men to be ſoe, what thoſe wretches did to the King for not being ſoe, and for not conſenting to impoſe it, vpon the kingdome by a law, the world knowes, and the world is wittnes, and they have robbed men of their poſſeſſions by the ſword to ſett vp this new Religion.

His charging *Covetuouſnes, and ambition to be the events of Epiſcopacy*, is ſchiſmaticall malice, for Epiſcopacie in the beginning of the Church was attended with povertie, and perſecution, but the libeller will make Martirdome their ambition, and wants their Covetuouſnes.

He will have, that *Engliſh Epiſcopacie hath markes of ſchiſme, whether we looke at Apoſtolicke times, or reformed Churches*, if he had ſhewed wherein, it had deſerved an anſweare, but we ſee what Apoſtolicke

times he meanes, that will not allow any Church of the world from the time of the Apoſtles til the preſent age, & becauſe the Church of England is not vniverſall, therefore all Sectaries may pretend themſelves the Church.

For the authoritie of Scripture, he neede not take paines to prove it. The Church of England claimes not power over other Churches, but to correct Schiſmatickes within her ſelfe. The expoſition of Scripture may not be received from arrogant Sectaries againſt the judgment of the vniverſall Church, & the King might very well reject ſuch reaſons, as they, which offered them, had ſoe lately before diſavowed, and pretended themſelves ſcandalized with the imputation of ſuch opinions. The greateſt number of theſe pretended Reformers profeſſed deteſtation of the opinion of lawfullnes in taking Armes againſt their Prince, of the opinion of the vnlawfullnes of Epiſcopacy, booke of Common prayer, and Ceremonies, and who now would diſpute with ſuch men maintaining theſe renounced opinions with ſuch bloody vehemencie.

It is not for the King to defend the Church otherwiſe then the Church would be defended. And what is the Church in the libellers ſenſe, nothing but the crew of John of Leydons ſaints, and muſt the King follow them againſt the Church, theſe are the Divills factours to ſett vp an Idoll Religion.

Theſe deceivers talke *of the power of the keyes, in whoſe power holy things are*, as if the keyes, that Chriſt gave to his Diſciples are tranſmitted to this diſtempered crew, that pretend a power of their owne giving.

Their Blaſphemous pretence of enthuſiaſmes hath been the wonder, and ſcorne of wiſe men, and thats the ſpirit which muſt not be *fettered with a negative voyce?* But may it not be fettered by the Parliaments negative voyce, and why is it more fettered by the kings then theirs? That which he calls Tyranicall, and preſumptuous in the king, with the ſame breath juſtifies in the Parliament, and yet complaines of Tyrany vpon the conſcience: Such conſciences are ſenſeles of Tyrany, aſwell, as of ſin having given themſelves vp to the Empire of hell.

The kings negative voyce could impoſe nothing, yet theſe deſperate hipocrites ſay, they were *compelled to implore the aide of Parliament to remove it from their conſciences.* And if the ground of their warr were to take away his negative voyce, their pretence of defenſive force appeares noe other then violence, and perſecution, which they ſoe hipocritically complaine of, & ſuch tender conſciences, as feele not ſalſhoods, and Rebellion muſt be mercileſſe deſtroyers of Religion, and Government, as theſe have proved.

The King had cauſe to ſeeke aide againſt Rebellion, and oppreſſion, but thats noe warrant for Traytours to linke themſelves by conſpiracies to performe it, and the King might juſtly wonder *at their confident boaſting*

boasting of Gods assistance, as if they had the certaintie of some Revelation, and flying to the Scotts succours, while they were soe furnisht with provisions for warr. And now after all the Libellers rayling at Episcopacie Copes, & surplisses, he will not permitt. *Arch Presbiterie Classicall, Provinciall, and diocesine Presbitery claiming Lordly power, and superintendencie to be imposed vpon them.* Heeres Babell confounded, and they, that were linkt in disloyaltie must part for Presbitery, and independencie, and will not see the evill spiritt, that first combined them in Rebellion, and now divides them to fight one against another.

A Determination by the best divines in Christendome in a full, and free synod is he sayes an improbable way, and every true Church hath wherewithall from heaven to be compleate, and perfect within it selfe. And why doth he tell vs, that *no Church denominated by a particular name bindes our faith, or obedience,* and hath any Romanist affirmed more for their infallibilitie, then he ascribes to every one of his Parlours, and wherefore is English protestant a Schismaticall name, as he affirmes, and *that the whole nation is not to be thought soe raw, as to neede the helpe of other nations.* But what is the whole nation to every conventicle, are theis seperaists the whole nation? And why would he bind the Kinge to other reformed Churches?

If the primitive Christians had been of his opinion, Generall Councells had been of litle vse, & the Disciples at Antioch needed not have sent to Jerusalem for advice in a question. But these men thus shuffle, and pretend the sufficiencie of a nation, intend only the perfection of their Parlour congregations, and allow noe sufficiencie in Church, or nation, that submits not to their insolent prescriptions.

He sayes *the King accuses pietie with want of loyaltie,* becaus he sayes *in vaine doe men hope to builde their pietie on the ruines of loyaltie.* The King rightly determines, that pietie is but pretended, where loyaltie is despised, as such doe that thinke it safe to renounce all fidelitie to their lawfull King, and his family, and depend on the faith of perjured villaines vpon pretence of pietie, as he perswades the Scotts to doe.

Vpon the

COVENANT.

HE seemes desirous to be short in this Argument, being a point, which he is loath to touch, till he see the successe of some attempts, and he would not willingly be out of hope of the Scotts, nor venture to displease them by his glosses.

To the mention *of the Biſhopps poſſeſſion heere ſince the firſt plantation of Chriſtianitie in this Iſland, and vniverſall preſcription ſince the Apoſtles till this laſt centurie* he ſayes, *But what availes the moſt primitive antiquitie againſt the plaine ſenſe of Scripture, which if the laſt Centurie have beſt followed, it ought in our eſteeme to be the firſt.* But where is the plaine ſenſe of Scripture againſt antiquitie? Its very plaine, that theſe Sectaries noe more eſteeme the preſent century, then the ancient, nor more the ſcripture then either of them, but take a libertie to vent their owne fanaticall, and arrogant fancies for Scripture, and reject all ordinary meanes vpon pretence of a lying ſpiritt. His Majeſt: meant not to oppoſe antiquitie to Scripture, but where the practice of antiquitie is conſonant to Scripture. Its impious to reject the Communion of the firſt age. All helpes of interpretation are fetters to the proud Schiſmatickes, and this Libeller, that ſo lately obtruded the Example of the reformed Churches in the caſe of Epiſcopacie, quickely ſcornes the Claſſicall, Provinciall, and dioceſine Preſbiterie, and the laſt Century hath only ſeene the aſcent of theſe Locuſts, and he only likes that part of the laſt Century, wherein they crept foorth, and they would willingly have the credit to be a part of other Churches, though they are in truth Enemies to them all. We may with farr better reaſon beleive the interpretations, and practice of the primitive Church, then any moderne Reformers, and there were never any, but thoſe Sectaries ſoe ſhameleſſe to deny the Authoritie of antiquitie, or charge it in this particular with an aberration from Scripture, and many learned men living vnder Preſbitery acknowledge the dignitie of Biſhopps above Preſbiters in the times of the Apoſtles. The Libeller likes any limitations in the Covenant, dangerous to the king, & ſoe much of the Covenant as concernes the caſting out of Biſhopps but he will ſweare, and forſweare comformitie to the Church of Scotland, or any other.

That this Covevant had *former practice*, vnles in the french League cannot be ſhewne. The Libeller would have the Iſraelites entring a new into *a Covenant with Aſa their King* to be a new Covenant, when it was only a renewing of their promiſe of obedience to God, noe Articles of their owne deviſing, and as that was with the King ſoe he hath found one without a King, for the Jewes, *after the captivitee tooke ſolemne oath to walke in the Commaundements of God* without conſent demaunded of that King, who was then their Maſter, and they had the Authoritie of that King. But did they take an oath to vſe violence againſt that King, if he conſented not to them, or was the Covenent to walke in Gods Commaundements a new Covenant? This is like their pulpitt proofes.

That *Proteſtant Churches have made Leagues, or Covenant againſt their King.*

Or

Or impoſed their confeſſions with Civill penalties vpon refuſers without their Prince is a notorious ſlander, for the *proteſtation*, it was confined to eſtabliſhed law, the Covenant to deſtroy law, and what was eſtabliſhed by it, the proteſtation to defend the Doctrine, the Covenant to deſtroy the Government, which is comprehended in the Doctrine, and this the Libeller holds *needes noe reconcitement*. There is noe doubt, but the Examples of Aſa, and Eſra were approved by Scripture, but they are farr from the Examples of the preſent Covenant, and if the Libeller approve the taking of the Covenant, how doth he ſatisfie himſelfe in the breach of it? he hath found out away, for he may aſwell breake that, as his oath to his King, and obligation to former lawes, which he ſayes are *Conditionall*, and that condition to be expounded by every man at his pleaſure.

He proceedes to ſhew the ſtrength of the Covenant, and yet he will keepe it one way, and his brethren of *another name, and ſect* another way. If he Covenant oblidge to contrary courſes, it cannot be a Rule of Reformation, and as it claſhes with former oaths to God, and the king rightly vnderſtood, ſoe the claſhing of theſe, that deviſed it, ſhewes, that the ſpiritt of peace was not deſired by the contrivers, of that Covenant.

That the Kings booke is *repleniſhed with Popiſh Arguments* muſt be ſpoken in a Corner, not publiquely with any modeſtie, for the Proteſtants throughout the world know the contrary, and will diſavow this Covenanting power to be a part of their Religion.

The ſalvoes, cautions, and reſervations vſed in taking the Covenant were the arts of the deceitefull compoſers, and its well knowne it was an artifice vſed to perſwade men to take it, that they might vſe the libertie of their owne ſenſe, and the Libeller willing to ſay ſome thing in detraction of the King vpon every occaſion, as if it were a ſin to vſe truth, and ingenuitie, tranſpoſes words of the Kings, which were vſed in reproofe to additions of his owne, as if the King approved theſe ſhuffling cautions, who he well knowes deteſted both the Covenant, and them, and ſhewed the inniquitie of theſe deceites, and we have ſeene, that theſe Cautions have made Covenanter, and anticovenanter, Preſbiterian, and independent Rebell.

The Libeller likes well *the povertie of the Miniſters of the goſpell*. And although the primitive povertie of Churchmen was very glorious, yet the Chriſtian Laitie were never ſoe ſordid to thinke a liberall patrimony vnfit for them, and Religion hath litle power, where the Clergie are trencher chaplaines to gluttons feaſts.

Theſe men, that judge povertie a curſe to themſelves hold *it Chriſts legacie to the Miniſters*. If there were any legacie, povertie was to all Chriſtians, aſwell, as Clergie, but we ſee, that notwithſtanding theſe profeſſions, their Levites now hold more pluralities without remorſe,

then ever were knowne, and ſhame not to contradict their former declamations, but it is the calamitie of the Church, that greedy doggs devoure her patrimony, and barking detractours traduce her Clergie.

Vpon the many

JEALOSIES &c.

TO wipe of Iealoſies, and ſcandalls the beſt way had been by cleere actions, or till Actions could be cleered by evident reaſons. Cleere Actions, nor evident reaſons will ſtopp the mouth of malicious ſlanderers, nor abate the induſtrie of conſpiratours in raiſing jealoſies, But theſe, which his Majeſt: complained of were tempered only to vulgar capacitie, and were long ſince hiſt at by all knowing men, who ſaw apparently they were not the opinions of the deviſers, but artifices of deceite, and the progreſſe of this Rebellion hath cleered al miſtakes, and taken away al credit from theſe fopperies. It is very late for the Libeller to call to his aide the petitions, and addreſſes compoſed by the faction in Parliament, when himſelfe accuſes them for want of wiſedome, and integritie, and whoever reades theſe addreſſes will eaſily finde not only cauſe to ſuſpect the truth of what they ſay, but plaine proofe of falſhood, and hipocriſie.

That the whole Parliament conſpired againſt the King, he never ſaid, and the author well knowes, that it was a potent faction only, to whome the King imputes this injurie, though their being elected to that place is no exemption from a poſſibilitie of errour, & Cryme, and we have ſeene it beyound doubt, that this faction conſpired *to blow vp the peoples affections towards him, and batter downe their loyaltie by the Engnies of fowle aſperſions*, and have acted what the powder plot intended. The King offers not to purge himſelfe by any other Arguments, then ſuch, whoſe proofe is viſible to all the world, and the ſillieſt people ſee, how they were cheated by factious Artiſts. The Kings Arguments are not only demonſtrable to the beſt but obvious to common vnderſtandings, and it cannot be expected, that ſuch, as are reſolute in wicked courſes *will aſke forgivenes*, or have it. The world knowes the King, when he wrote this, expected the Rebells crueltie, but feared it not, and there was not cauſe to vſe inſinuations, which were not to be divulged, till his death. Tyrants, and vſurpers are forced to flatter, but its a wicked ſlander to charge him with flatterie, that is feareles of crueltie.

This

This Libeller prophanely descants on Scripture, as he doth apparently vpon the Kings misfortunes, for vpon the Kings saying, that *he could willingly be the Ionah for restoring his peoples tranquillitie, if he did not foresee, that by the divided interests of their, and his Enemies, as by contrary windes, the storme of their miseries would rather be encreased then allayed.* The Libeller sayes *these windes were neuer heard of in the compasse.* And its very likely never regarded by those, who never guided themselves by other compasse, then sea robbers, that make prey only their compasse. But were not these divided mindes heard of, when he spake of Archpresbitery, and other subdivisions? And *these windes* he sayes *were pretended to be foreseene least he should be taken at his word.* The King foresaw their intended murther, and thongh he feared it not, his word never was to be taken to make himselfe accessory to his Enemies impietie. But *that controversie*, he sayes, *divine lot hath ended.* Suffering, and Martirdome hath been the lot of the righteous, but Gods controversie with their persecutors is not thereby ended, and the Libeller reckons too soone, the end of his controversie, that entitles God with such Actions.

The Kings knowledge is sufficiently evident, and he hath distinguished *the venerable gray haires of ancient Religion from the old scurfe of superstition*, and the vertigo of novell prophanes. And the *wholesome heate of his well governing* shewes his judgment in *state Phisike*, and while Empericks, and horse leaches tooke vpon them to amend the body, they turned *the equall temper of it* into *the feaverous rage of Tyranizing.* There neede noe oracle to tell, who *heated the furnace* of this obloquy, it is sufficiently confessed, and they, that endured Nobuchadnezars furnace might have warned this Libeller to have abstained from that allusion, for if the oracle of truth, God himselfe commaunded the Jewes to be subject to Nebuchadnezar notwithstanding his golden Image, and madnes.

The libeller might see his litle witt ill applyed in making the question, *who deserved to be throwne in Nebuchadnezar, or his three Kingdomes?* And this high conceite of his deserves the fieric furnace, that would perswade three Kingdomes, they might cast in their King.

If his greate seale were not sufficient without the Parliament to create Lords, his parole must be vnable to create learned, and Religious men. Surely this man doth not see what he sayes, for it is a confessed truth, that the kings greate seale without Parliament was sufficient to create Lords, and though his judgment could not create men, yet by the choise he made, men are satisfied, he descerned them better, then they, that would vndertake to point them out.

The opposition proceeded from heads farr wiser, and spiritts of a nobler straine, then popular preachers. And are not their buffe, and sword preachers popular preachers? And are those wiser heads and nobler spiritts the Creatours of preachers? And hath the tub overturned the pulpitt?

The

The Prieſt led herodians with their blinde guides, are in the ditch already. Theſe are the conſtant Teſtimonies of the Libellers reverence to Scripture, and things ſacred, whats become now of the advice of the Parliament, and three Kingdomes? He was very much overſeene, that would have divided intereſts ſuch vnknowne windes, and heere blowes away his brother Preſbiterian for a Prieſt-led herodian, and blinde guide, *travelling as he thought to ſion, but moor'd in the Iſle of weight*, And we ſee, that theſe, who began firſt with the Biſhopps will at laſt have noe Preſbiters at all, but pretend with the Rebells againſt Moſes, that all the congregation is holy, and will ſayle by the winde of their owne braines without Card, or Compaſſe. Factions are not only like Mathematicall Lines allwayes diviſible, but perpetually dividing. The Kingdome of England cannot acknowledge the wiſedome of thoſe heads, from whome the deſigne of deſtroying King, and Kingdome proceeded, men willfull for miſcheiſe are farr from wiſe heads, nor is inſolence, or inhumanitie a Teſtimony of noble ſpirits. Popular preachers now ſee they were deceived in their owne judgments, and abilities to governe, aſwell as of the goodnes of the lawes they were governed by, and the perſons, to whome they owed ſubjection, and that their planting of diſaffection to the Church of England in the people could not attract reverence to them, but an attendance vpon vſurpers, who made vſe of ſuch preaching to improve the peoples diſobedience to their lawfull Rulers, and they may now ſee, that averſion to the Church is a falſe meaſure of ſinceritie, and that their followers after the ſhaking of their lawfull governours, call them, by whoſe ill principles they were miſledd, blinde guides, and while this Libeller would ſeeme to be a Chriſtian, he not only ſeekes to make the name a reproach, but the miſeries thereof a ſcorne, whence comes his alluſion of Prieſt-led herodians, but from the paſſage touching the place of our ſaviours nativitie enquired of the Prieſts by herod. & travelling to ſion is not the ſubjects of common paſquils.

The Kings letter to the Pope imports nothing to his purpoſe, and all men now ſee, that Religion is not at all in their thoughts, and that theſe repetitions are vulgar ſcare crowes.

The *innovations* alledged by profeſſed ſchiſmatickes, that innovate at vnqueſtionably demonſtrate their owne confutation.

His vſing the aſſiſtance of ſome Papiſts in ſetling proteſtantiſme was vnſeemely, and ſuſpicious. But the vſe of them againſt ſuch, as would vnſetle the Civill Government, and deſtroy the King vnder pretence of vnſetling the Religion eſtabliſhed, is juſt, and neceſſary, and it inferrs not, that *the moſt part of Proteſtants were againſt him*, becauſe an active faction had ſurprized the ſtrength of the Kingdome, and neceſſitated him to ſeeke ſuccours, where he might have them, the King never obtruded ſetlement of any thing new, but defence againſt violence

violence of what was eſtabliſhed, and Papiſts may fight for their King, though Traytours pretend to the Proteſtant Religion, for the ground of their qnarrell.

That noe man ever thought, that the King had learned that difference of perſwaſion in Religious matters may fall out, where there is the ſamenes of dutie, Alleagiance, and ſubjection, And the Libeller aſkes, *wherefore then ſuch compulſion to the Puritans, and Scotland about conformitie to the Leiturgie?* Doth the King ſay, that thoſe of different perſwaſions ought not to be better informed, and ſought to be gained to a right vnderſtanding? though there may be the ſamenes of alleagiance, ought he not to ſeeke the ſamenes of perſwaſion in points of difference? This is his common logicke, and he aſkes, *wherefore then noe Biſhopp, noe King?* He might have anſweared himſelfe, that there may not be the ſamenes of opinion touching alleagiance in differences of Religion, though there may be, and its now plaine, though formerly not beleived, that ſuch, as would have noe Biſhopps, would have noe King, and had not the ſamenes of intention, though the ſame dutie, and obligation of alleagiance to their King, as thoſe of the contrary perſwaſion, and that Epiſcopacy is agreeable to Monarchy, the contrary not, but Rebells catch at every ſhaddow, and offer every dreame for a truth, and are as light in obtrudinge pretences, as reſolute to act their villanies either with, or without them.

How diverſified ſects, can be all *proteſtants*, muſt be ſhewed by ſome doctrines, that proteſtants yet vnderſtand not, and the *medly of Papiſts, and proteſtants* in a religious cauſe is noe more *diſproportioninge of Religions*, then the mixing of thoſe diverſified ſects, which are noe more proteſtants, then Papiſts. Maſkes, and diſguiſes were the foreprophecied garments of Sectaries, and it is a ſure ſigne, that their errours are willfull, not weake, ſparing noe falſhoods, whereby they may get power, and confating their pretences by their practice They heretofore profeſſed greate oppoſition to Papiſts for doctrines of Rebellion, now they preach the ſame doctrines, & are angry, that there are papiſts, that diſclaime them. The ancient Chriſtians held it a Religious cauſe to defend their King, & Countrey, & were mixed with Pagans in that cauſe, and ſoe of late the proteſtants of France, and they held it vnchriſtian to forſake that Religious cauſe vnder pretence of Religion, and thoſe pretences taken from Religion, the letter to the Pope, and evill Councellours, are apparent to be nothing, but vulgar cheates to enforce the King to conſent to the Rebells demaunds, and wreſt his ſcepter from him.

The ſharpe afflictions of the Kingdome ſhew they were not *inveterate diſeaſes of Governments*, but a ſuddaine peſtilence, and ſuch, as can beleive, that the Tyrany, of the preſent Maſters are the lawes of Parliament, deſerve to be governed by a whip, not by a ſcepter. The Libellers reproofe of the peoples levitie, prayſe of popularitie are inconſiſtēt,

and his argument of reproach from dissenting to what the Parliament advised, and his charging the Parliament for want of wisedome, and integritie turne all his arguments to his owne shame, and shew, that it is not right, but Rebellion he pleades for, and that he esteemes neither Civill, nor Philosophicall libertie which are confined to Government, but confusion, and licence without limitts.

If this Libeller would be subject *to a Magistrate, and in the lawes*, as he professes, why doth he Rebell against the Magistrate, and the lawes, and why doth he pretend the Parliaments Authoritie, if he may breake that authoritie? As indeede he doth alow, that noe obligations of Government can hold him, and by the same rule he pretends injury to be restrained in one thing, he may in every thing, and these Rebells like *Lucifer* vsurpe above all *scandall*.

Though men ought not to speake evill of dignities, which are just, yet nothing hinders to speake evill of those, who in their dignities doe evill as oft, as it is the truth. Thē the Scripture vnnecessarily forbad to speake evil of dignities, for we may not speake vntruth of any person, & if the Scripture meant noe more then not to slander, in commaunding not to speake evill of the Ruler of the people, St. Paul needelessely retracted his words of the high Priest. It shewes how neere the spiritt of Lucifer, these men are, that pretend a right to practice whatever our Saviour, or such, as were inspired of God, forbad vpon pretence of actions done by power extraordinary, and yet there is no example of this speaking evill of dignities, as the Libeller imagines, nor of publique reproaches. Though *Kings were reproved*, it was by such, as had particular directions from God, not by every wandring levite, and they did not defame them to others. And as his Maj: we beleive was heard of God in mercy, so he might without *injury to the Prerogative of Christ* pray to be made *the head stone of the corner* according to that subordination, which he held vnder God, and Christ in ruling his people.

Vpon the

ORDINANCE

against the booke of

COMMON PRAYER.

INnovations are generally more dangerous, then *old errours* by how much peace is more desireable, then broyles, and combustions. We have noe warrant to beleive such a condition in the Church of God, that should allwayes be reforminge, nor

that

that the Christian Church had never lawfull Pastours, nor any thing practised according to Christs institution, till the present Sectaries revealed it to the world. We have found by experience, that there is noe *dotage* equall to that men have vpon their owne opinions, nor any greater errours, nor mischeifes more dangerous, then such, which are introduced by pragmaticall Reformers, who would conforme the world to their fancies, and innovation is oftner obtruded vnder the name of reformation, then reformation is censured, and opposed vnder the name of innovation.

The King sayes not, *that the removing of the Leiturgie was a thing plausible to the people*, as he falsely relates, but sayes, that *after popular contempts offred to the booke, and those, that vsed it, it must be crucified by an ordinance.* His Majest: likens not the rejection of the booke to the *crucifying of our Saviour*, but the carriage of the rejecters to the cursed Jewes, who crucified our Saviour, and these men, that rejected the booke shewed as litle reverence to him, that was to be prayed to by the formes in that booke, as to the booke it selfe.

King Edw. 6. confesses to the Cornish Rebells, it was noe other, then the old masse booke done into English some few words expung'd, which is very false, though al, that is in the old masse booke is not therefore to be rejected, and these men may aswell make an Argument they may not pray at all, because the Masse booke prescribed prayer, aswell as reject formes of Devotion, because they were in the masse booke.

It was the Carnall feare of divines, and Politicians, that modelled the Leiturgie, noe further of from the old masse, least they should incense the people. This hath been the conceite of Schismaticall Politicians, though the lightnes of it be very apparent, for it cannot be thought, that the people would be more incensed by an alteration of the prayer, then an alteration of the language, and the taking away of the externall superstitions was more likely to incense the people, as it did, then any alteration of the Leiturgie, and it had been very easie to have made any alteration in the Matter, when the language was changed, and in the time of Queene Elizabeth, when no such feare could be pretended, the demaunds of the schismatickes for abolishing the leiturgie were held frivolous, and seditious.

The Libeller sayes *good desires rightly conceived in the heart, wholesome words will follow of themselves.* But wholesome words will beget good desires, and how publique prayer in the congregation can be vsed, vnles a leiturgie be admitted noe true Christian can finde a way.

That *the prescription of a Leiturgie was not imposed, nor practised by the first founders of the Church*, is an apparent falshood, The Lords prayer, and the prescriptions of the Apostles to make prayers for all men, for Kings, & al in authoritie, that we might leade a quiet life in all godlines, and honestie, and the many leiturgies yet extant convince all, but will-

full gainſayers, and it had been in vaine for the Apoſtle to commaund the people to obey ſuch, as had the overſight of them, if they had noe authoritie to preſcribe things lawfull, and honeſt, and this Libeller, that hath been floriſhing with authoritie of the reformed Churches, heere condemnes them all, who, none excepted, vſe Leiturgies.

Without whoſe (meaning the firſt founders of the Church) *precept, and example, how conſtantly the Prieſt puts on his gowne, and ſurpliſſes, ſoe conſtantly doth his prayer put on a ſervile yoke of Leiturgie.* It ſeemes the mention of gowne, and ſurpleſſe are inſtede of Arguments to his well principled men, and ſoe is yoke of Leiturgie, though by his owne confeſſion, that yoke is not in the Leiturgie it ſelfe, but only for the ſuppoſed want of precept, or example, for if there had been either of them, as both are apparent, there had been noe yoke in his judgment, neither can that be a yoke in Religion, which is not ſinfull, and ſin there cannot be without breach of a law, and if the Libeller could reduce Leiturgies within that compaſſe, he neede not vſe thoſe beggerly negatives, and if the vſing of Leiturgie by the Prieſt be a yoke, doe not the peoples prayers, that put on the Prieſts extemporary words, put on a yoke of Leiturgie? For are not his words aſmuch yoke to them, as the publique Leiturgie of the Church to him? And it is evident, that they, who vſe noe ſet formes in publique prayer, direct them more to the hearers, then to God, ſtudying for expreſſions of their owne parts, while others, that vſe ſet formes have their affections more enlarged, and not yoked to the ſearch of words.

Set formes are not rigorouſly forbidden to any mans private infirmitie. But they are rigorouſly forbidden, if they are thruſt out of the Church, and every mans prayers, and ſpirit impriſoned in *the pinfold of ſet words*, haſtily ſhuffled togeather by a man often times as defective in wholeſome words, as ſound Devotion, whoſe *doſes* of vnprepared words, and matter leade the people into imprecations, rather then prayers, & theſe men, that would confine all publique devotions to the ſudden raptures of every vnlearned Levite, ſeeke to *ſhutt heaven* at their pleaſure, though their *hands* are as *ſhort*, as their vnderſtanding, and the ſpiritt of vtterance, as it reſpects our prayers, is not exerciſed in words, but in the affections, which are vtterances to God.

What we may doe in the ſame forme of words is not ſoe much the queſtion, as whether Leiturgie may be forced, as he forced it. And why doth he ſay forced it, meaning the King, when it was eſtabliſhed by his Predeceſſours with conſent of Parliament, which the Libeller ſoe much pretends to reverence? And he may eaſily anſweare his queſtion, that would have the forme of words vſed by every Miniſter to be forced vpon all congregations, and we may juſtly vſe the ſame words allwayes, that containe pititions of all things neceſſary.

The

The Leiturgie comprehends not all truth. And doth he thinke, that all truth ſhould be comprehended in prayer, or that any *benifitt, or vſe of ſacred expreſſions is denied vs*, vnles all the expreſſions of Scripture are conteined in publique prayer. We have the full benifit of all ſacred expreſſions, if our neceſſities are fully repreſented, but his ſpirit of vttérance is the vſe of varietie in expreſſion, as if there were a neceſſitie to vſe all expreſſions to the ſame ſenſe, and he would have ws beleive, that the benifitt of ſacred expreſſions is *barralled* vp in the new tub men whoſe *prayers not only want ſalt*, but are beſmeared with prophanes.

Though God raigne downe new expreſſions into our hearts, yet it is not fitt for the whole Church, to be yoaked to the fancies of every Levite, who often miſtake, *Satanicall injection for the dew of heaven*, and he is much miſtakē in his compariſon of retaining the forme of wholeſome words to *reſerved Manna*, but the loathers of this Manna of wholeſome words are the true offſpring of theſe murmerers, that loathed the Celeſtiall Manna, and bread of Angles, becauſe they had it allwayes, accounting it a light foode in regard of their ſenſuall appetite, as theſe men now thinke the formes of the Church light in regard of the ordinary vſe, & of their owne parts, which they would expoſe to the people, and therefore, if Leiturgies, were Manna it ſelfe yet if whorded vp, and enjoined they will be found ſayes the Libeller like reſerved Manna, rather to breede wormes, and ſtinke.

For the *varietie of words*, though God have given vs plentie, and that we ought not *to be nigardly of them to him alone*, yet we finde long prayers, and vaine repetitions condemned by God, and we are commaunded, when we come before him, that our words be few, and *the queſting of Scripture Phraſe in prayers* is now found wanting in leiturgies, that was ſoe lately ſcorned by the libeller for *the lipp worke of every Prelaticall leiturgiſt*. Sectaries prayers, though dreſſed with varietie of words are accompained with a nigardly devotion, wherein God cheifely requires vs to be copious, & this libeller is copious in blaſphemy, that wil have the word of God, if whorded vp, and injoyn'd to breed wormes, & ſtinke.

The libeller would have his ſcoffes received for Argument, & to vilifie the vſe of ſett formes brings in the *famine of the ſeidge of Ieruſalem*, whē the Prieſts *brought ſtill the ſame loaves of the ſhewbread*, not being able to procure new, & he would give vs ſtones for bread, the Phariſees ſtill continue their old leaven of hipocriſie, though their words be varyed.

If the Lords prayer had been a warrant for leiturgies, why was neither that, nor other ſet forme after vſed mentioned by the Apoſtles, or commēded to our vſe. It had beē very needeleſly preſcribed by our ſaviour, if it had never beē vſed afterwards, & it had been diſobedience in the Apoſtles, if they did not vſe it, being by our ſaviour commaunded. It is the commō argumēt of heretickes to accuſe God of improvidence, vnles he proportiō his revelations to the meaſure of their fancies, & though the Counſel of God, & ſupernaturall truths to be beleived were fully revealed, we may not beleive, that nothing was left to Chriſtian prudence in the Church

of God, and we cannot pretend want of revelation in this point, where we have ſuch expreſſe preſcription of the Lords prayer, and particular injunctions of the Apoſtle St. Paul, and if we muſt expect ſuch revelations, where is it revealed that every congregation muſt vſe only ſuch words, as the Miniſter thereof extemporally dictates in their prayers.

If God left our words to be putt into vs without premeditation, why then doth the Libeller allow any mans private infirmitie to vſe helpes? will not God help private infirmitie that way, Or is every one in the congregation without infirmitie. How is any aſſured if the promiſe be vniverſall.

Our ſaviour encouraged his diſciples with promiſe of aſſiſtance without their premeditation, And why doth he object want of Chriſtian diligence to ſet formes, if it be a fault to vſe it, and all muſt be done without premeditation. And its like his preachers pray & ſermonize without premeditation by the ſtuffe they vtter, and we ſee what reſpect they beare to God, that preſſed diligence in their actions touching this life, & Rebellion, & exclude it from devotion & that, which concernes God. what ſoever the Libeller ſayes concerning *Gods graces*, is nothing to the queſtion, touching the vſe of Leiturgies, vnleſſe he would have, that in the publique congregation, every perſon ſhould have his prayer a part, and bring that diſorder, which the Scripture forbidds.

Voluntary prayers are leſſe ſubject to formall, and ſuperficiall tempers, then ſet formes, for in thoſe hee, who prayeth muſt conſult firſt with his heart, which in all likelihood may ſtirre vp his affections. But he doth moſt commonly conſult with his braine both for matter, what is moſt pleaſing, and what moſt proper in expreſſion, and it is incident vnto moſt to fall into an affectation of their owne conceptions, and abilities in theſe voluntary prayers, rather then true devotion.

Affections grow laſy in ſet prayer, and come not vp eaſily at the call of words. But much more eaſily, then in the labour for words, and matter, and thoſe words are moſt emptie of devotion, and prayer, which are the oſtentation of the preſenters abilities, who is apt to ſeeke ſatisfaction in contemplation of his owne parts, and his fervour is greater in looking on himſelfe, then God.

Oſtentation, and formalitie may taint the beſt duties. And why not then the beſt inſtitutions, and if *vnpremeditated babling may be reſtrained without forbidding the ſpirit of God*, which is in his ſenſe his extemporary prayer, why may not *laſines, and formalitie* be reprehended in ſuch, as vſe the publique leiturgie without forbidding the vſe of it, but it is, as himſelfe ſayes *the Cuſtome of hipocrites to take advantage at the leaſt abuſe of Good things, that vnder that covert, they may remove the goodnes of thoſe things, rather then the abuſe.*

Conſtancie attributed to the vſe of ſet formes, he calls *the conſtancie of the Cuckoe to be allwayes vſing the ſame Leiturgie.* And what then are his beſt

beſt reformed Churches: this ſhewes him one of thoſe chattring birds, that Abraham drave from his ſacrifiſe, and this wretch trembles not to compare the ſett formes appointed by God himſelfe in the Scripture to the Cuckoe, and the vſe of the Scripture is the conſtancy of the Cuckoe.

The booke for aught we know was compoſed by men neither learned, nor godly. But they are vngodly, that without knowledge will ſuppoſe them neither learned, nor Godly, but was the Martirdome of many of them noe proofe of their Godlines? And are there noe workes, that prove the learning of thoſe Compoſers, doth this man thinke vpon the credit of the proteſtant Religion?

Noe doubt *the ſpiritt helpes our infirmities*, but we have noe promiſe, that the ſpiritt ſhall enable every Chriſtian to compoſe prayers for the whole congregation, neither doth the Libeller beleive, that all his Miniſters of the new Religion are ſoe endowed, if he doe, he hath few aſſociates.

It is Gods promiſe, that where two, or three gathered togeather in his name ſhall agree to aſke any thing, it ſhalbe graunted. And how can they agree without a preſcript forme, is the agreement, that all muſt follow the deſires of one? That there was a Leiturgie in the Chuch, of the Jewes hath not been denyed by any learned man, & its apparent by the Titles of many of Davids Pſalmes, that they were vſed by the ſingers in the ordinary ſervice of the Church. That Chriſtians vſed the Lords prayer, and other ſett formes cannot be denyed, and the Libeller is much deceived in his computation of the time, when Leiturgies begun, for the Church never wanted them, and we have ſeene by experience, that *true pietie*, followed the vſe of Leiturgies, diſobedience, and prophanes the rejection of them, & ſuch, as have rejected them, have proved not only *Truants*, but Apoſtates to all ſanctitie.

What is ſaid of Leiturgie is ſaid of Directorie, and ſoe farewell Preſbiterian. We finde, that none make ſuch preſumptuous claime to *Miniſteriall guifts*, as ignorant, and braineles perſons, that have noe Title by calling, or endowment.

The King had noe reaſon to object, that the Common prayer booke was rejected, becauſe it prayed ſoe oft for him, for large, and laborious prayers were made for him in the pullpits. But its well knowne, that the Sectaries were neither large, nor laborious in ſuch prayers, and its juſtly doubted, not ſincere, when they vſed them, but would have men heare their hipocriticall formalitie, not God to graunt what they ſeemed to pray for, and all men can witnes what prayers were made for him in pulpits after the leiturgie was rejected, al the largenes, and labour appearing in their prayers was to reproach his perſon, and procure him diſhonour, and miſerie.

The King in his prayers preſumes Leiturgies to be lawfull. What ſhould hinder?

hinder? *praying that the Church, and he might never want them.* And *what* ſayes the Libeller *could be worſe prayed extempore,* he might have anſweared himſelfe, that *Prayer* to want them was to call for Deſolation vpon the Church.

Of the Differences in point of

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

THe Libeller ſayes, *the Author in this Chapter diſcovers more of miſterie, and combination betweene Tyrany, and falſe Religion, then from any other hand would have been credible.* Tis ſtrange, that ſoe obvious, a truth ſhould be incredible from any hand. Was not Jeroboams new Religion the foundation of a Tyrany, and have not all vſurpers in the Civill ſtate pretended ſome falſe Religion? Was not Mahometts wicked impoſture, and Tyraniall vſurpation bredd togeather, and have not the preſent Tyrants introduced a falſe Religion to ſupport their power? Hath not ſchiſme been joyned with the Rebellion?

We may have learnt both from ſacred ſtory, and times of reformation, that the Kings of this world have ever hated, and inſtinctively feared the Church of God. Its manifeſt Sectaries hate King, and Church, malefactours will complaine, that Judges hate them for their vertues. We finde in the ancient Church, that Kings were the greate protectours, and reformers of the Church, and its ſtrange that the Libeller, if he had looked backe at all, had not ſeene David, Solomon, Hezechiah, Joſiah, and others. The Kings of Iſraell politiquely oppoſed the true Church, for feare the people ſhould returne to the houſe of David, and if we looke vpon Pagan Kings, we finde Cyrus, and Artaxerxes helping the eſtabliſhment of the true Church. This Libeller hath diſcovered a greate Miſterie of Rebellion, that having made ſuch outcryes of Tyrany againſt his late Maj: heere tells vs the Tyrany was Monarchy, & they would not be ſubject to the Kings of this world, to ſuch impoſtors is England now ſubject, that kill Kings, and make Tyrants, and this blaſpheamer ſtickes not to charge the Church of God, and the Doctrines thereof with oppoſition to Civill Government, and to commaund the deſtruction of Kings.

Becauſe

Becauſe the doctrine ſeemes to favour Libertie, and equalitie. And are there not Republiques that oppoſe the true Religion? True Religion preſſeth obedience, falſhood, and impoſture allwayes hold foorth licence to the people. Is there through all the booke of God one word in favour of this Rebell, libertie, and equallitie? And did not God plant his Church at firſt in an apparent inequallitie, and ſubjection both in the ſtate Civill, & Eccleſiaſticall? And this broode of Sectaries have heeretofore complained, that their doctrines were traduced as oppoſite to Monarchy. And neither Libertie, nor equallitie is ſought for to the people, but to betray them to the power of theſe deceivers, who are growne to that impudence to pretend doctrines of confuſion, and Rebellion to be the true Religion.

The Church, as ancient propheſies foretold ſhould diſſolve all their power, & Dominion. Few ſects profeſſing Chriſt have appeared more Turkiſh, then theſe preſent of England, they fancie an earthly Kingdome for the Church, as Mahomett his Paradiſe, and then, that themſelves are the true Church, and ſhall have Dominion over all, and avow their intention to deſtroy all Kings, and whoever ſubmitt not to them. But certenly Kings vnderſtood not any ſuch propheſies, nor feared ſuch pretenders, who make propheſies to agree with their owne wicked Actions, and ambitious deſires.

His firſt inſtance is *in Pharaohs oppreſſing of the Iſraelites.* And doth he beleive, that Pharaoh knew their doctrines, or propheſies, the man might have learnt more from the Text, that being ſtrangers they might over power him, and thence grew his perſecution, not from the libellers imaginary doctrine. He makes a ſtrange leape, that paſſes by all ſtories els, and would prove his poſition by his owne authoritie, and expects, that his libell againſt the King ſhall make good his poſition, that Kings ever feared, and hated the true Church a ſtrong way of diſputing, to prove that kings hated, and feared the true Church, becauſe the King did ſoe, and to prove the King did ſoe, becauſe kings did ſoe, this is a ſtout Champion.

There neede no anſweare to his bawling of the kings *ſuſpition of men moſt Religious*, for time hath tryed, that they were Rebellious, and wicked Traytours vnder the Maſque of Religion.

He could not vſe violence as Pharaoh did, and therefore chuſes a more miſticall way of Antichriſtian fraude, and like Balak to hire againſt a nation of Prophetts other eſteemed Prophetts, and to weare out the Church by a falſe Eccleſiaſticall Policie. The Summe is to ſupreſſe Sectaries, and prevent Traytours is this Eccleſiaſticall Policie, but where is this Miſterie of Kings hating the true Church, is there noe true Church of God where there is Government? And what proportion hath this ſuppoſition of his to the kings proceedings? Did he erect Biſhopps, or was there any Religion eſtabliſhed, or publiquely profeſt, which he oppoſed, but

only falſe, and hipocriticall factioniſts, which outwardly profeſſing the eſtabliſhed Religion ſought for gaine, and pride, ſecretly to draw diſciples after them to the diſturbance, & ſubverſion of the Church. There needes not any thing be ſaid to his rayling, his corruption being apparent by objecting it to the calling of Biſhopps, and hates it, for the remedy againſt ſchiſme, which the Church had by them.

The King *beſtowed livings* according to the law, and the Policie was not his, but the ancient conſtitution of the Church, and this Monſter, that reproaches the retaining any thing in Leiturgie, or Government practiſed by the ancient Church is not aſhamed to charge the king with breach of Canons, and the ancient practice of the Church in conferring Eccleſiaſticall dignities, and the peoples right in Elections was never pretended in England, and juſtly, and anciently forbidden in the Church, neither doe any Canons in force ſupport that pretence.

That influence, which the king ſayes *is neceſſarie for the Prince to have vpon Churchmen*, noe man, that beleives the Scripture will thinke vnfitt, but how can the Libeller make good, that the many Emperours, and *Kings*, that imbraced the Chriſtian Religion *hated, and feared it*, for ſoe they muſt by his grounds? And how can he conclude from Pagans hatred to Religion, that it was only from their kings, when as the ſtories are ſoe plentifull in ſetting downe the madd rage of the multitude, the truth is ſeditious innovatours know, that their hopes, and ſtrength lie to ſeduce the ſilly people, and that it is the intereſt of governours, to prevent their lewde endeavours, and thence proceede their declamations againſt Rulers, and their proclamations of Libertie, and that, which they cal the Biſhopps Tyrany is only their office to take away ſchiſme, and ſchiſme is the way to Rebellion.

The Libellers judgment touching *callings* founded on Scripture, *reformation*, or *graces* of the Biſhopps, and others is of the ſame authoritie, as the determinations of Traytours touching loyaltie, and hereticks touching ſound doctrine, and his end never agrees with his beginning, but in rayling, and incongruitie, for but now he made it the Kings Policie to hire the Biſhopps, & now it is the *Biſhopps* Policie to worke that perſwaſion in the King *of noe Biſhopp, noe King*, the man well knowes, that noe Biſhopp, noe king was the perſwaſion, of King James, who found it true by his owne experience without the helpe of Biſhopps, and yet ſoe ſottiſh doth this Libeller preſume his readers, that makes the dependence, which Biſhopps have only of the king the cauſe of ſuch perſwaſions, & *yet in their owne ſubtill ſenſe, they were of another minde*, how thē could their dependence be a cauſe of their perſwaſion, or was their ſenſe ſubtill, and groſſely miſtaken. Thus thoſe blattering devills, that in the beginning of the Parliament charged the Biſhopps, to be Antimonarchicall thereby to conceale their malice againſt the king, now make it their Cryme to favour Monarchy.

He

He hath found a very ſtrong proofe, as he would have it out of the Hiſtorie of the Councell of Trent, that *Biſhopps are moſt potent, when Princes are weakeſt*, that argues not their dependence vpon Princes, nor that averſion to Biſhopps is not averſion to Princes, it was ſpoken of Biſhopps depending on the Pope, not on Princes, and ſuch Clergy men, as have their dependence on Pope, or people wil never wiſh, that the king ſhould be potent to maſter their dependencie.

From this the King ſett himſelfe to the removall of thoſe men, whoſe doctrine he feared would be the vndoing of Monarchy. And needed he the Councells of Biſhopps to provide for his ſafetie againſt ſuch men? And is that the evill intereſt of Tyrany, and Epiſcopacie to prevent the deſignes of Traytours? Who were Traytours, if they were not, that would vndoe Monarchy? The doctrine, and deſignes of the ſchiſmatickes are heereby apparent to be againſt Monarchy, and yet the prevention of ſuch conſpiracies is the Tyrany, and the corrupt Councells of Biſhopps, which the hipocrites cry out on.

Noe temporall law could touch the innocencie of their lives. And had they innocency, that plotted the vndoing of Monarchy vnder which they lived, and could not the law touch it? Their diſobedience to lawes was a Cryme inconſiſtent with innocence, and muſt neceſſarily be puniſhed by the lawes they diſobey, and that, which he calls *perſecution of their conſciences, and laying ſcandalls before them* was only the requiring of their obedience to Acts of Parliament, whoſe authoritie he ſoe frequently cryes vp, and the inflicting of juſt *penalties* on their *bodies, and Eſtates* according to the lawes was the dutie of the Magiſtrate, to whome the execution of them belonged, although the indulgence they found from his Majeſt: in mitigating the penalties of law was a greate cauſe of their inſolence, and that Calamitie they have brought vpon the kingdome, and if the lives of theſe men be ſought into, their pride, impudence, calumnie, lying, perjurie, covetuouſnes, and crueltie declare their lives farr from innocent.

The man now breakes out into a thankeſgiving for the ſucceſſes of their Rebellion, and though theſe hipocrites deſpiſe the thought of a Church, and have noe Communion with any Church, ancient, or moderne, yet the reſiſtance of them is *warr againſt the Church.*

Noe Papiſt could ſpeake more ſcandalouſly againſt reformation, then that Epiſcopacie was the conſtant practice of all Chriſtian Churches, till of late yeares Tumult, pride faction, and covetuouſnes invented new modells vnder the Title of Chriſts Government. It neede not be obſerved againe, how the Libeller is affected to the reformation, that deſpiſes all but his owne Babell, and Tumults, factions, pride, and covetuouſnes, the cauſes of ſome new modells touches not ſoe many, as he ſuppoſes, there being ſoe many of the reformed Churches, that receive not theſe new modells, but whoever they be, that obtrude them, as Chriſts Government,

Scepter, and Religion, they will be marked with the ſame names, that are heere mentioned by the greateſt number, if not all of the reformed Churches.

The Apoſtles were not properly Biſhopps, next Biſhopps were not Succeſſours of Apoſtles in the function of Apoſtleſhipp. If the Apoſtles were not properly Biſhopps he ſhould have told, how they were improperly Biſhopps, for by his caution properly he admits they were ſomeway Biſhopps, and the Biſhopps therein their Succeſſours, though not in that part of the Apoſtleſhipp which concerned ſpeciall guifts, and the Teſtimonie of Chriſts converſation on earth, whereof they were eye wittneſſes,

If they were Apoſtles, they could not be preciſely Biſhopps, and why not preciſely, if Biſhopps.

They could not be Apoſtles, his reaſon is, becauſe *that of Apoſtle was vniverſall, extraordinary, and immediate, the other ordinary fixed, and particular charge, and inſpection.* The calling of the ſeventie diſciples was vniverſall, extraordinarie, and immediate, and yet they were noe Apoſtles, and becauſe callings were at firſt extraordinary, muſt not they, whoſe office it was to provide Succeſſours to themſelves, and others in the Church of God, ordaine others into their functions, and is it an Argument, that becauſe, when the Church was gathered, men had particular care of certaine Churches, therefore they were not of the ſame calling with others, that preceeded them in gathering theſe Churches, and the latitude of territorie in the exerciſe of a mans calling doth not make difference in the function.

It is *a*gainſt reaſon, and Charitie to ſuppoſe an *ignorance, and deviation* of the ancient Church taught by the Apoſtles in a point, that deſtroyed the calling of ſuch, as were to reproach the goſpell, and the *ſuddenneſſe* is not imaginable in the introduction of Prelacy, vnles by Apoſtolicall conſtitution in regard of the vniverſalitie, and the Author cannot name any manifeſt corruption ſo ſudden, and vniverſall after the Apoſtles, though he pretend many.

The Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtorie proves it cleerely to be falſe, that noe example ſince the firſt age for 1500 yeares can be produced of any ſetled Church, wherein were many Miniſters, and congregations, which had ſome Biſhopps over them. And his proofe is out of Sozomen, who, he ſayes, wrote above 1200 *yeares agoe*, and his Teſtimony, that in the Churches of Cyprus, and Arabia they had Biſhopps in every village, what then? he ſayes *what could theſe be more then Preſbiters?* Yes they were Biſhopps, for doth any man doubt, that Biſhopps, and Preſbiters were not diſtinct in Sozomens time, who ſoe frequently mentions it, and the Libeller complaines of the corruption of introducing them in the ages foregoing, there are many Councells before Sozomen, which were vniverſally received, and in them ſubordinate of Preſbiter to Biſhopp is the vndeniable practice

practice of the Church, and the quantitie, or quallitie of Townes, or Territories, wherein Biſhopps were placed, noe way proves the leſſening of their order, neither can it be collected, becauſe Biſhopps were in ſmall villages, that therefore they were noe other then Preſbiters, but heerein the Libeller ſhewes his malicious oppſition to truth in abuſing Sozomen, who having ſaid, that Churches had ſeveral cuſtomes, & inſtances, that though there were many Cities in Scithia, there was one Biſhopp only over all, and in other Countreyes Biſhopps were in villages, not every village, & he might aswell conclude noe Preſbiters in Scithia, as none, but Preſbiters in Arabia, and Cyprus.

The ſame Author tells the like of other nations, and that Epiſcopall Churches did not condemne them. Wherefore ſhould they condemne them? Its like they would, if they had taken vpon them to exerciſe the calling of Biſhopps being but Preſbiters, for that was long before condemned by the Canons.

He makes a large leape from ſozomen to fower hundred yeares agoe, and then he ſayes *many weſterne Churches in France, Piedmont, and Bohemia admitted not of Epiſcopacy among them*, and yet the doctrine, and practice of theſe Churches publiſhed by themſelves is, that they had Biſhopps, & continue them ſtil, & this the libeller might ſee in their own bookes.

If we might beleive what Papiſts have written of the Waldenſes, he findes *in a booke written 400 yeares ſince, that thoſe Churches in Piedmont held the ſame doctrine ſince the time, that Conſtantine with his miſcheivous donations poyſened,* Thus the exploded forgery of conſtantines donation is made authenticke to reproach the Church, *Sylveſter and the whole Church.* This is the Schiſmaticall Charitie to the firſt Chriſtian, Emperour, and the whole Church, but the man might have remembred, that Biſhopps by his owne confeſſion were long before the time of Conſtantine, and if we beleive the waldenſes themſelves, they had Biſhopps in their Churches, who held the ſame doctrine, and Government, and the antiquitie of the waldenſes proves, that they had Biſhopps, otherwiſe they had beē condemned by the ancient Church, as Aerius, was, for if there had been any Churches, differing from vniverſal practice in the time of Conſtantine, it is not imaginable, that they had been vnobſerved, & wee finde noe mention of their diſſent, but from the Papacie, and that long after.

The famous Teſtimonie of St. Jerome, whereto he referrs the reſt is farr from *declaring openly*, that Biſhopp, and Preſbiter are the ſame thing, but the contrary is manifeſt in him, for what proofe can there be drawne from ſaint Jerome, that Biſhopps, & Preſbiters were the ſame thing, who ſajes, that befor ſchiſme by inſtigatiō of the devil entred into the Church, & that one ſaid I am of Paul, another of Apollo, another of cephas, al things were governed by the common counſel of the Preſbiters, and who will thinke, that there were no diſtinct orders, becauſe things were governed by the commō counſel of Presbiters, & whē theſe

ſchiſmes began, and when things were ſoe governed, were there not Apoſtles in the Church, and ſuperiour to Preſbiters?

St. Ierome affirmes, that Biſhopps rather by cuſtome, then ordainement of Chriſt were exalted above Preſbiters. St Ierome ſpeakes of priviledges given to Biſhopps above Preſbiters by cuſtome, but he affirmes the power of ordination belonging to them, and not to Preſbiters Though St. Ierome make a difference betwixt the ordainment of Chriſt, and the practice of the Apoſtles, neither he, nor any good Chriſtian ever queſtioned the lawfullnes, & authoritie of ſuch Cuſtome of the Church in the times of the Apoſtles, and this man, that in this very Chapter ſaid the King produced noe Scripture, and that antiquitie was not of weight againſt it, now gravely determines that interpretation of St. Ierome in his ſenſe ſhalbe received before *intricate ſtuffe tatled out of Timothy, and Titus.* Thus this prophane hipocrite proſtitutes Scripture, where it contradicts their practiſes, and St. Ierome ſhalbe preferred before Scripture, if he ſeeme to favour their ſenſe, and vilified beneath Eſops falles, if he diſſent from them.

If it be farr *beyound Court Element* what is ſaid by his Majeſt: it is not above his owne, the proper Element of this breaker is prophanes, and impudence, and heere againe he importunately obtrudes the Kings letter to the Pope, which he makes a cheife ſupport of his Trayterous pretences, but the authoritie of a gazet out of which he quotes it, is too meane to rayſe a ſcandall vpon a Prince in the judgment of any reaſonable men, and this man well knowes the fraude in publiſhing that falſe Copie of the Kings letter, which he willfully paſſes by, and the ſatisfaction, which the King gave the Parliament, and whole Kingdome vpon his returne out of Spaine, & the diſſolving of thoſe Treaties, which occaſioned that letter muſt ſtopp the mouth of all detractours to offer it as an argument of his Majeſt: inclination to the Roman Religion?

The Libeller anſweares his Majeſt: argument to prove *his ſufferings out of conſcience, not Policie, becauſe his loſſes were more conſiderable then epiſcopacy* with objecting *hardning, and blindnes*, being himſelfe hardned to oppoſe all light of truth, and ſhut his eyes againſt the cleereſt demonſtrations.

Where hath more faction, and confuſion ever been bredd, then vnder the imparitie of his owne Monarchicall Government. The king pretended not, any Government could abſolutely ſhut out faction, but we may be ſure thoſe factions are moſt dangerous to all Governments, whoſe principles are deſtructive to it, and theſe factions were not bredd in the conſtitution of Monarchy, but among the Enemies af it, and the envious man ſowed his tares, while men ſlept, and as he will not *ſtand powling of the reformed Churches to know their numbers*, ſoe he wil hand over head affirme, that the farr greater part in his Majeſt: three kingdomes deſired what *they have now done to throw downe Epiſcopacie*, which hath as litle weight

as

as truth. the reformed Churches are not vilified one by another, though each maintaine their severall formes of Government, and his Majest: is farr from vilifying those Churches, but the Libeller vilifies himselfe, and them that scoffs at their Archpresbitery classicall, and Diocesine Presbitery, and their Priest-led herodians, blinde guides.

None but Lutherans retained Bishopps, and therein convinces himselfe of his often repeated vntruths, that all the reformed Churches rejected Episcopacy for the Novations, Montanists having noe other Bishopps, then such, as were in every village is another of his falsities in adding the word every, and it doth not prove, that these heretickes had not Bishopps, and Presbiters, which Christians may have, though they live in Caves, and deserts, and its evident in story those heretickes had Bishopps. That the Aerians were condemned for heretickes the Libeler well knowes, and the King naming them soe meddles not with their particular heresies, and it is too obscure to be seene, that the King fastens that opinion touching Bishopps, and Presbiters for their heresie. Though the Clergie ought to minister the gospell, if the people supply them not, yet such temutie, and contempt quickely becomes a Carkase indeede. The Sectaries, that place their greatenes in being the ringleaders of faction turne all Religion into a fantasme, and knowing they could never by any judicious choise obtaine preferment in the Church professe the dislike of them, and seeke their fortunes in seducing the multitude.

Its easily beleived, that *wealth may breede vices* in the Clergie, aswell, as others, but must they therefore be made poore, and others rich by the robbery of them? the Kings choise of Bishopps will convince the clamours of the Schismatickes, and gives just cause to expect the evill consequences the King foretells of their removall. That the function of Bishopps, and Presbiters was not tyed to place, though the exercise of it was by Ecclesiasticall constitution, he hath been already told, and that it was necessary the Apostolique power for the Government of the Church must descend to Bishopps, there being noe others, that ever pretended to it.

How *the Church florisht vnder Episcopacie*, the extent of the Christian Religion over soe greate a part of the world doth sufficiently testifie, & the *corruption* of many in that *order* doth not take away the benifitt of it, which acrewed vnto the Church by the labours of others, and all ages have recorded persons of greate learning, and holines of life in that order.

He talkes againe of the Kings *Coronation oath to give vs such lawes, as our selves should chuse*, when he knoweth, that the clause, which he pretends to be in that oath imports noe such thing, nor was that oath, wherein the clause is pretended ever ministred to the King, nor diverse other Kings, nor ordeined to be soe.

In

In likelihood they were neerer amendment, that ſought a ſtricter forme of Church diſcipline, then that of Epiſcopacie. But they that ſought to remove Epiſcopacy would have the Church diſcipline in their owne hands, that it might be looſe, and in likelyhood they would not be ſtrict to themſelves, his boaſting of what the Scotts could worke by power, ſhewes, that he regards nothing right, but power, and ſoe he can prevayle, deſpiſes all Juſtice, and conſcience.

Vpon the

VXBRIDGE TREATIE.

THat *men may treate like beaſts, aswell, as fight*, noe way oppoſes his Majeſt: Aphoriſme, which affirmes Treaties, *a retiring from fighting like beaſts to agreeing like men*, Treaties being managed only by the vſe of reaſon, fighting by force, and his Majeſt: ſpake of the nature of Treaties, not the abuſes of men in them, and though ſome fighting may be manlike yet the Act is common to beaſts, rationall Treaties cannot

The Kings march, and fight at Brainford, the Libeller would make *a thirſt of warr though in the rigour of Marſhall law, it might have been excuſed in a naturall Enemy that makes a trade of warr.* And may as juſtly be defended in the King, whome that faction, which proferred a Treatie to him at Cole-brooke intended to ſurprize him, having diſpoſed their forces in ſuch places, as muſt have effected it, if he had not ſpeedily prevented it by that onſet. What he intimates touching Oxford, Briſtow, and ſcarborrow naming noe particulars, he can expect no anſweare, & whoever lookes over the memoriall, of paſſages touching Treaties will finde that the Kings offers were ſoe large, as nothing, but deſire of peace could have moved him to it, and nothing but guiltines, and ambition could be the cauſe of their refuſall.

That the faction in Parliament would have compelled him *to part with his honour as a King*, the Libeller denyes not, but aſkes *what honour he had, but the peoples guift*, & yet he ſeekes to defend the Actions of theis villaines, as defending themſelves, and reſorts to his common principles that *Kings are but the ſervants of the people, who may diſpoſe of their Kings, and their honour as they thinke beſt.* And by his doctrine the King, and people

people must be the prey of every powerfull Traytour. It neede not be repeated, that the peoples welfare consists in supporting the rights of their King, and that it is their miserie to deprive themselves of him, and turne into confusion, and slavery to vsurpers, And it is Monstrous, that a kings *highest Court sitting by his regall authoritie should bandie themselves against their soveraigne*, and like vipers eate out the bowells of their parent, fighting against that power, which gives them being, and by an vnnaturall malice of the members to the head cast the whole body into an incureable consumption. This insolence, and presumption of the pretended Parliament hath brought the loose rabble, and lawles Army to despise the representation, which they soe much magnifie, and doe that vnto them, which they did vnto their king. It cannot be doubted, that subjects cannot with dutie treate on equal termes with their king, and the practice of all times makes it manifest, that none but Traytours attempted it, and it was a sufficient proofe of the kings desire of peace, that he sought a Treatie, where a submission was due to him.

The Kings instructions were to bribe their Commissioners with promise of securitie rewards, and places. How he proves such instructions he tells vs not, but we are sure, that the demaunds of their Commissioners were securitie, rewards, and places, for they would have all in their power.

There were but three heads of the Treatie, Ireland, Episcopacie, and the Militia, the first was forestalled by a peace, that the King might pretend his word against the Parliaments Arguments. And if there had not been a peace made, it was a most detestable Rebellion, and blood thirstie crueltie to continue an intestine warr against the King, and his people of England, vnles a few Tribunes might have the management of that warr in Ireland, and exclude the King from any interest in that kingdome, and yet this must be a defensive warr on the Rebells part.

The King bids the Queene be confident, he will never quit Episcopacy, which informes vs by what patronage it stood. And how could that informe you, even as well, as the Kings telling her, that Religion was the sole difference betweene them, informes you, that the Queene directed him in matters of Religion.

The sword he resolves, sayes the Libeller *to clutch as fast, as if God with his owne hand had put it into his.* And there is noe doubt but he had, and it was a Rebellious wickednes in that faction, which sought to wrest it from him in despite of Gods ordinance, and their owne sworne subjection. In all these the King had reason, honour, and conscience on his side, and his pretence, that the Queene was *Regent* in all these is farr from credible, when causes to the contrary are soe obvious to every vnderstanding. The Libeller himself professes their intentions to take away the Kings right, and would suggest to the world, that it was only the Queenes Councell, that he would preserve his Crowne,

Wiſe men could judge the compoſure likely to be more miſerable, then happy. But theſe wiſe men were taught by their guilt never to thinke themſelves ſecure, and to preferre their power before their conſcience, and the Kingdomes peace.

The Engliſh were called Rebells during the Treatie. And why not? till the Treatie had made an abolition of their offence, for did they forbeare any of their reproachfull termes, or Rebellious actions againſt the king, and his partie during the Treatie?

The Iriſh were called good, and Catholique ſubjects. And that ſome of them might be, though the Libeller cannot produce the inſtance of it.

The Parliament was called a Parliament for faſhions ſake, and in the Counſell bookes enrolled noe Parliament. That it was no Parliament all knowing men agree, and the enrolling of their opinions, that held it noe Parliament was noe injury to the Treatie, and the Kings appellation of them a Parliament, becauſe they would not be treated with otherwiſe gives them noe right, nor ſhutts vp him from that opinion of their condition, which was true, and reall. Chriſtians treate with the Turke by thoſe appellations, he will be called by, though they doe not acknowledge them belonging to him.

It was a divelliſh fraude, that the King in his owne eſteeme had been abſolved from performance, as having treated with Rebells, and noe Parliament, and they inſteede of an expected happines brought vnder the hatchett. Who now doth not ſee, that force, and guilt were the continuers of this horrid Rebellion, and blood, and that theſe Traytours perferred their private ſecuritie before publique peace? But whence is this collection of a divelliſh fraude by a divelliſh interpreter? If the King thought not the appellation due to them, which he gave them, doth it follow, that he muſt eſteeme himſelfe abſolved of performance of his promiſes therefore? Theſe are dreames from divelliſh infuſions, not reaſonable ſuppoſitions, the titles of treating parties having noe influence vpon the performance of the things promiſed, and they of the other ſide might have ſaid, they were abſolved from performance, becauſe they treated with the Kings Commiſſioners vnder other Titles then they had, or were knowne by, but they would perſwade the people, that they cannot be ſafe vnleſſe the maſter Rebells rule.

May not that *bratt ſuperſtition* be juſtly laid to their charge, that impoſe for the Scepter of Chriſts Kingdome a yeſterdayes invention of congregationall conſiſtories, and make it Religion, and truth of God to roote out Prelates of the Church of God?

For the meritt of the Treaties, and where the blame lay of their breach, the world hath long ſince full ſatisfaction, and that the Rebells came but vnwillingly to Treaties, and with reſerves allwayes to breake it of, never mittigating the rigour of any propoſition in the leaſt degree, and though the Libeller, and others ſpitt Sulphur, and caſt foorth

their

their cloudes of lying, and ſlander, yet the evidence of the facts diſſolve, and conſume their venome, and confidence, and the meaneſt capacitie deſcernes the falſhood, and crueltie of their proceedings both in warr, and Treaties.

Vpon the

VARIOUS EVENTS

Of the warr.

IT is noe new, or vnwonted thing for bad men to claime as much part in God, as his beſt Servants. And all men looke vpon the Rebells in England, as the vnparalleld prodigies of this hipocriſy, their claimes vnto Gods ſervice, and favour, the vſurpation of thoſe appellations, that belong to the Godly, their oſtentations of faſtings, prayers, and thankesgivings, and ſevere cenſures of the perſons, and manners of others, are a ſufficient demonſtration of this preſumption of men hardned in wickednes, and reſolved to proſecute ambitious diſignes.

He is yet to learne what good vſe the King made of theſe various events, neither will he acknowledge, though he ſee the vſe of inſolence, & crueltie, which the Rebells have made of their ſucceſſes againſt him.

Thoſe numbers, which the King grew to from ſmall beginnings, came not out of love, but fled to be protected from the feare of reformation. A jolly conceite, what feare of reformation was there, or appeares yet? It was neceſſary dutie to oppoſe Rebells, and confuſion, and that was then knowne vnto the ſillieſt people, but ſuch, as were poyſened by the contagious doctrines of Rebellious Sectaries.

Such a ſnow ball might eaſily gather through thoſe cold, and darke provinces of ignorance, and lewdeneſſe. And can he thinke, that any Provinces are ſoe ignorant, and lewde, as theſe ſinkes, and Kenells, whence the Rebells raked the rabble of raſcallitie, which they armed againſt the king? The libeller could not be ignorant of what al his partie acknowledge, the greate diſproportion in qualitie both for place, and education, that was in the Kings partie above their owne.

The Libeller would have *Gods long ſuffering ſometimes to harden, and*

be the beginning of a ſeverer puniſhment. But he over-lookes that ſenſible obduration, which ſucceſſes have brought vpon the Rebells, and as they are a ſevere puniſhment vpon the nation, ſoe we may conceive by their wickednes, that their proſperitie bindes them over to greater judgment.

He would convince the King of *breaking lawes, and that he had not the ſword by law, not ſoe much, as to vnſheath againſt a forraigne Enemy.* And by ſoe palpable an vntruth, it being knowne vnto the whole world, that Leagues, and warrs with forraigne nations were made by the King alone we may conclude, he hath quitted ſhame, & is reſolved to ſticke to his falſe aſſertions, and *tottering* Arguments, though never ſoe contrary to his owne Judgment, & knowledge, & heere againe he repeates his jaded diſcourſe of a *free nation, body of Parliament, and ſword in a ſingle hand* ſo often ſpurred vp, and downe ſince the beginning of his booke. The libeller, if he would have vſed Arguments ſhould have expreſſed wherein his pretences differ from other Rebells, for all pretend Tyrany in their Rulers, & fighting for libertie, but he will have fighting lawful to make a new Republique, and to take the ſword to deſtroy the old, & inſteede of making the King guiltie of the breach of lawes, juſtifies the Rebelliō, becauſe lawes were executed. Whatever he objects for a reaſon of Rebellion againſt a King is as poſſible to any other Government, for are all Republiques of one Religion, & may the ſubjects of different Religion from what is eſtabliſhed in any ſtate Rebel, & ſay it is vnreaſonable, that rulers muſt be obeyed, when they wil not conforme to the opinions of a ſect, & ſo ſeverall opinions muſt decide their Religion by the ſword. If ſuch Rebells die *Martirs* we have been much deceived of malefactours, and noe Traytours will want a ſaint-ſhipp.

This opinion of his touching the *holines* of Rebellion, he ſayes, *is not the opinion, but full beleife of farr holyer, and wiſer men, then Paraſiticke preachers*, For holy, and wiſe men the Libeller ſeemes to be litle acquainted with, and vnles they be the ſcandall of preachers, and baſeſt of Paraſites none can be ſoe vile to maintaine ſuch odious aſſertions. Its well knowne the Crim catching ſermonizers to theſe Rebells have confidence enough to ſpeake what they know not, & men hired to act a falſe part will bluſh at nothing; and therefore, though never King was eſtabliſhed by Parliament, nor could be, becauſe they depended on him, and were called by him: though Parliaments never acted in law, Civill oaths, nor Religion but by the Kings aſſent, and the oath which he calls the Kings, and hath ſoe often mentioned, was never eſtabliſht by Parliament, yet againſt all evidence this libeller, & his Mates will affirme, that *nothing was thought to be eſtabliſhed, which that houſe declares to be aboliſhed.* Its like he meanes the houſe of Commons, which never till theſe blacke times pretended a power to give an oath, much leſſe make a law, and ſuch, as make theſe vaſt vntruths outgoe Paraſiticke

ticke preachers, and all knights of the Poſt, that are yet diſcovered.

It were abſurd to give the Parliament a legiſlative power, and vpbraide them for tranſgreſſing old Eſtabliſhment. Whoever thought them to have a legiſlative power? Is not the King the Legiſlatour, and they his Counſell, and is it not abſurd to give the Legiſlative power to them, that are to adviſe the Legiſlatour, and when the two houſes deſire the King, that it may be made a law by the King with their conſent, is it not abſurd, that one houſe ſhould ſay all the Legiſlative power is in them? But there neede noe proofe of their tranſgreſſing old eſtabliſhments, when they confeſſe it. Its like the Rebells thinke their *heaven* heere, and they doe not much value the loſſe of the other, and noe man is troubled with his cenſure, to whome Charitie, and truth are alike deſpicable.

The Libeller, that ſcoffes at the ſeeking of heaven in *forma pauperis* ſhewes his value of heaven, and ſeekes none but that, which is to be found in forma proditoris. He thinkes to take of the horror of their death, that dyed in willfull perjury, and Rebellion againſt the king by raving againſt the kings partie, *who* he ſayes *died moſt frequently with oaths, and other damning words in their mouths*, And is ſoe impotent to hope, that the Calumnies of a perjured wretch will finde creditt, for were he not diſtempered by helliſh deluſion, or ſottiſhly drunken, he would not ſoe ſtupidly affirme, that it was *notorious, that they, who were hotteſt in his cauſe, the moſt part of them were men oftner drunke, then by their good will ſober*, it being a knowne truth, that men of moſt eminent ſobrietie were hotteſt in the kings cauſe, & theis traytours never forbare any wickednes by their will but for their ends. The king neede not a diſcovery to the *ſtate of their conſciences*, more then by their Actions, that fought againſt him, and he might juſtly beleive *they had never the better of him in their owne conſciences, where they were more affraid to encounter thoſe many reaſons from law, alleagiance, and Chriſtian grounds, then in a deſperate bravery to fight.* And is it to *preſume more then a Pope to ſay this?* But he that will not ſticke at open falſification will not ſticke to ſlander thoughts, and offer conjectures for convertions, ſuch as were moſt zealous in his Majeſt: cauſe had a ſobrietie vnblemiſhable by a Traytours malice, and were not only free from *druken* diſtemper, but brutiſh inſolence, and brazen impudence, which the Rebells rather affect, then repent of. And is there not a juſt cauſe, that the conſciences of many *ſhould grow ſuſpitious, and corrected* by the pretentions of the miſnamed Parliament, now proved falſe, and vnintended? Whats become of their making a glorious King, lawes of the land, priviledges of Parliament? Doth not every man ſee they are all in the dirt among the Libellers Ceremonies.

But they never pretended to eſtabliſh his Throne without our Libertie,

and Religion, nor Religion without the word of God, nor to judge of lawes by their being eſtabliſhed, but to eſtabliſh them by their being Good, and neceſſary. They never pretended, that his throne was inconſiſtent with libertie, or Religion, nor to judge of lawes otherwiſe, then by being eſtablished. But who muſt be the *Dictatours*, the Parliament, which is crumbled into a cloſe Committee, and ſtate Counſell, or any rabble, that ſhall ſay this, or that law is not good, and therefore to be repealed, though eſtabliſhed, he ought to have concluded, that they never pretended priviledge of Parliament further then the ſubterranean junto, or the Tumults ſhould judge neceſſary.

To pray, and not to governe is for a Monke not a King. But is prayer inconſiſtent with Government? Thoſe men will accuſe the King for being a Chriſtian, and have as litle love to prayer, as obedience, a monke will better governe, then ſuch a man pray, who is conſtant to malice, & falſhood, and this man that ſayes to governe by Parliament juſtifies his Rebellion to take away Kinglie Government.

His legiſlative Parliament, and oppreſſed lawes cannot be admitted, where other anſweare is wanting, but the Libeller hath long ſince thruſt the force of them out of doores by his many prevarications, confining them all in the Cabinet of his owne braine, which muſt determine whether they be good, and neceſſary.

He is conſtant to Iohn of Leidens principles, that muſt take away other mens goods for doubt of ill vſing them, and becauſe the King ſayes, he *feared the temptation of an abſolute Conqueſt*, therefore it was *pious, and friendly in the Parliament to reſiſt him.* Their pietie, and friendſhipp were much alike, and the Libellers Riligion might come in for a ſhare. Its very probable, that this warr had never been, if the Act for continuance of the Parliament had not been conſented to by the King, and that Act might ſtopp the mouth of any reaſonable man, from ſaying there was ſuch a power in the two houſes, as the Libeller dreames of, that deſired that Act from the King, and it was never heard in our ſtory, that ever *Parliaments* made warr againſt *Kings*, *as Tyrants*, or otherwiſe, for how could they make awarr, that neither could, nor ever did pretēd to ſit longer, then their King pleaſed, & the immodeſtie, & ingratitude of the preſent Rebells have farr exceeded the worſt Examples.

He is obſtinate to his principles, and feares to attribute any thing to the Kings conceſſions, or denyall, and had *he graunted leſſe* in all probabilitie himſelfe, and the Kingdome had ſuffred leſſe.

It cannot be doubted, but the Libeller will invert whatever the King ſayes, and it is a greate adventure, that he ſayes *the ſins of their lives not ſeldome fought againſt them*, and wee have greate cauſe to beleive their proſperitie did noe leſſe, that continue hardned in ſoe execrable a cauſe.

The King ſayes he deſires not *any man ſhould be further ſubject to him, then all of vs ſhould be ſubject to God.* And this Mountebanke holds this *a*

ſacri-

sacriledge worse, then Bisshopps lands, for he sayes he desires *asmuch subjection, as is due to God, and so desires noe lesse then to be a god.* And is subjection to Princes in the, Lord subjection to them as God? And doth the King desire otherwise, that would have them noe otherwise obey him, then that they might obey God, renouncing all obedience, that consists not with obeying God, but sale worke must be slight, and the Libeller would not exceede his hire.

The Rebells desiring the Kings *acquittall of them for the blood of the warr* confirmes their guilt, not their innocence. Though God impute not to any man the blood shedd in a just cause in respect of the ground, and reason of doing it, yet there may be temptations vnto naturall infirmities in acting a just cause, and the King was not without a sense of such danger, therefore the Libeller wretchedly beggs an argument of his guilt from his prayer *not to have blood imputed to him.*

Vpon the

REFORMATION

Of the Times.

Noveltie, and perturbation are justly condemned not only by Christians, but morall men, and it is a noveltie taken vp only by Sectaries, that would confine all Religion to their owne frensy, and reject the vniversall consent of all times, and places, and not only boasting of the truth of their owne delusions, but obtruding them vpon the world, threatning fire, and sword to gainsayers, and yet they will pretend the example of our Saviours publishing his gospell, and pretend like reason for their fanaticke conceites, as for his divine revelations, and miraculous Testimonies, and because reformation may be necessary, therefore they conclude it must be as often, as these, that are carried about with every winde of doctrine shall thinke fitt, & they would reduce Christianitie to a cloud without water tossed to, & fro with the breath of private opinion.

The first reformers *in the time of Pope Adrian* pretended not a reformation of the vniversall Church, and a rejection of whatever was received by the primitive, as those men now, neither did they presume to enforce

enforce others to their perſwaſion, and though *noveltie, and perturbation* were objected to them, yet they ſtill deprecated that guilt, and it is a moſt vnchriſtian, and prophane diſpoſition to deſregard lawes eſtabliſhed, and Religion ſetled vpon preſumption of private opinions, and theſe of men neither learned, diſcreete, nor honeſt. There is greate difference betweene a clamour, and an vndeniable truth, and we may not thinke, that *popular compliance, diſſolution of all order, and Government in the Church, ſchiſme, vndecencies, confuſions, ſacrilegious invaſions, contempt of the Clergy, and their Leiturgie, and diminution of Princes* are leſſe odious, becauſe Papiſts objected them, or that any pretended reformation introduced by theſe deteſtable practices can be acted, or approved by Chriſtians, All men are wittnes, that the preſent Sectaries are guiltie of all theſe, The former reformers did not give occaſion for ſuch aſperſions, that deſired only the libertie of their owne conſciences from the practice, and beleife of errours newly enjoyned, and anciently rejected in the Church, or els followed the orderly reformations which Princes, and ſtates authoriſed in their owne Dominiõs, but theſe new reformers obtrude their dictates vpon all the world, and will diſpoſe of all Kingdomes with the Divill, as in their donation.

Let it be produced, what good hath been done by ſynods ſince the reformation. Its like not the good he meanes to authoriſe all manner of Lewde ſects, and Lunaticke opinions. But ſynods are cuſtomary, and have their ſet times in all the reformed Churches, and if there be *fraude, and packing in ſynods*, as he ſayes, whence come Parliaments, that are of like conſtitution to be free? Is there a priviledge of Parliament to change nature, and that the members cannot be guiltie of fraude, faction, and Treaſon? There is not only fraude, and packing by inſinuations, conſpiracies, and corruptions of the vulgar, but violence, and confuſion to Church, and ſtate by tumultuary reformations, and what is this doctrine of rejecting ſynods, but the juſtifying of all licentious violence, and Lewde Rebellion to introduce mens private opinions.

The pulling downe of Church windowes, and Croſſes, which were but Civill not Religious markes, defacing the Monuments, and inſcriptions of the dead, mentioned by the King are the effects of a popular, and *deceitefull reformation* in the account of all true *proteſtants*.

That *Proteſtants were accuſed by Papiſts*, as theſe are charged by the King will not parallell guilt, nor hide the preſent Actions of theſe Traytours from view, and deteſtation.

The Libeller doth very prepoſterouſly produce the Example of *Iob, whoſe ſinceritie was accuſed to God*, as a protection for the hipocriſie of Sectaries, while himſelfe acts the part of him, that accuſed Job to God, and omits not the traducing of all proofes of pietie, Religion, and Juſtice in the late King.

But the infirmities of beſt men, and ſcandalls of hipocrites in times of reforming

ming can lay noe juſt blemiſh vpon the integritie of others, nor purpoſe of reformation. Noe man ſayes it did, but if the Reformation it ſelfe be a noveltie pretending not the conſent of any times, but their owne opinions of places of Scripture different from all others, if that, which is offred in the name of reformation be in it ſelfe confuſion, and ſcandalous imputing Antichriſtianiſme to all the Churches of God, that were before them, and that the way of introducing it be with preſumption, blood, and Rebellion, we cannot thinke, that any promoters of ſuch an vnchriſtian deformitie can have any integritie, or Religion, and they are not blemiſhed, with the Crymes of others, but their owne. They, that have no publique place, nor authoritie to reforme the Church cannot be excuſed of preſumption, if they meddle with it, and ſuch buſy bodies are moved with Carnall ſelfe ſeeking, and private ambition, not ſenſe of dutie.

If any thing *grew worſe, and worſe in the Church of England*, it was the encreaſe of Sectaries, who would cover their hipocriſie with cenſure of ſuperiours, and lawes. Theſe Reformers pretend to reforme lawes, not corruptions, for though they talke of the time of the Kings Raigne, they pretend to reforme nothing, that was particularly worſe in his time, then before, and he might aswell have aſked, why Queene, Elizabeth in her fortie yeares raigne had not reformed, as peeviſhly talke, that his Majeſt: ſhould not reforme in *twentie yeares*, when it was held ſtrange, that the Schiſmatickes ſhould be ſoe diſtempered to pretend a neceſſity of reformatiõ, there being greater neede of ſtrengthning what was eſtabliſhed. It is a Diabolicall Method to change the order of the Church by deſtruction of the Civill ſtate, & juſt reformation never oppoſes lawful authoritie in ſetting vp a Governmẽt over others. Though *Chriſtians might reforme themſelves*, they allwayes judged it an abomination to impoſe their Religion vpõ the ſtate they lived in. Private reformations are of Chriſtian right, but publique are the prerogative of ſupreame power, and though *Princes ought to ſerve God in the firſt place*, the people are not to deſtroy Princes in the firſt place, they may worſhipp God, though they be perſecuted, they cannot truly, if they take the ſword to ſubdue them, that are in authoritie, and they feare not God, that feare not their King, our feare of God bindes vs to vſe noe violence againſt our King, nor vpon others, our Alleagiance to our King being a part of our dutie to God, and as the Apoſtle convinces thoſe, that hate their brother, not to love God, ſoe in vaine doe they pretend to feare God, that offer violence to their King. Can a Chriſtian breake all the lawes of the ſecond table vpon pretence of keeping the firſt? And did not he, that Commaunded to have noe other Gods, but him, commaund the honour of Father, & Mother? May a private Chriſtian robb, and kill, becauſe perſons are not of his Religion. The ſcripture ſajes, he that is guiltie of the breach of one commaundement, is guiltie of all, and though Chriſtians may not obey Commaunds

contrary to the commaund of God, they may not vse violence, & force, but these are the Pharisees, that teach men by making a vow vpon pretence of Gods service to disobey Parents, which our Saviour soe much condemnes. Christs Kingdome is spiritual in the hearts of the faithful, not in *a papall consistory, nor a congregationall pullpitt*, they were best Christians, that obeyed not wicked commaunds, but detested by all Christians, that vsed violence against their Pagan Governours, and the reformed Churches may see what Communion can be had with those, that professe those best Christians, that were least subject to their King.

The King of Spaine may professe to have his Kingdome from Christ, whatever his Religion be, he hath a just Civill right, which none ever doubted to acknowledge, but these hell bred Sectaries, that allow noe right, but what is founded on their will, & his repetition of the Letter to the Pope vpon this occasiō shewes he is vnder a famine of reason, that makes the Kings constācy to the doctrine of the Church of England to proceede from his letter to the Pope, calling it enmitie to the true Church, are any soe madd to thinke, that the Pope was pleased with the doctrine of the Church of England? Did the Libeller thinke there were a God, would he write soe willfully against his owne vnderstanding, that *the King engaged himselfe to hazard life, & Estate for the Roman Religion*, he would then thinke, that God were neere him, & *writt downe those words*, which he will one day require an account of.

The King prayed against his hipocrisie, and Pharisaicall washings, whose prayer is, *thou, who must give truth for hipocrisie suffer vs not to be miserably deluded by Pharisaicall washings*. Poeticall licence will not wash away willfull slander, and malicious falsification, but this man makes hipocrisie, and Pharisaicall washings his cheife study, and hates the prayers of others for his conversion from such wickednes.

Vpon his

LETTERS

taken, and

DIVULGED.

THE Publication of the Kings Letters had quite contrary effects to these, which the publishers intended, and insteede of discovering matter to their advantage, cast shame on their false aspersions, whereby they sought to withdraw the

the affections of his people from him, they ſett foorth both his judgment, and affections oppoſite to Poperie, & the Iriſh Rebells, and the peace made with them not out of favour, but neceſſitie to divert the finall deſtruction of the Proteſtant partie there. The endeavours to be aſſiſted with forraigne forces, when ſoe horrid a Rebellion had taken deepe roote was neither againſt any former profeſſions, nor any rules of Juſtice, and pietie, but naming of Papiſts, and forraigne forces were the bugbeares, wherewith the faction affrighted the ſilly people, and vnder pretence of revenging the blood of Ireland, ſought to draw men inclinable to aſſiſt the King, or vnwilling to fight againſt him into that imployment, that he might be more expoſed to their power, and they might have the better meanes to weaken him, and ſupport their owne Rebellion. Theſe Letters have diſcovered their groſſe impoſtures in repreſenting the King wholy Governed by the Queene, or others, ſhewing cleerely, that his owne judgment cheifely ſteered his owne affaires, and its like the faction long ſince ſaw their owne raſhnes in that Publication, and that the world tooke notice, that they were ſoe farr from doubting the Kings affection to Popery, that their deſigne was cheifely to declare his averſenes to it, that they might prevent his ſuccours from Princes of that Religion.

That it was done by them *without honour, & Civilitie*, no man boubts, vnles infected with Schiſmaticall, or Rebellious malice, and betweene King, and ſubjects matters can never be in that condition, that his honour, and their dutie are *trifling, and ſuperficall vanities*, and with whome they are ſoe we may not wonder at any brutiſh, and inhumane Barbaritie, when was there an example of ſuch a Treaſon againſt nature, and humanitie to divulge the Letters betweene man, and wife touching conjugall privacies? And *honour, and Civilitie* being taken, as he would have it for *diſcretion, honeſtie, prudence, and plaine truth*, the publiſhers of theſe Letters not only ſtand guiltie of the breach of thoſe vertues, but appeare the venemous, and vnnaturall Traytours to mankinde.

To cover this baſe Act the Libeller ſayes, that ſuch courſes are *familiar with none more then Kings*, and produces, an Example out of *Commines* relating the diſcovery of a Letter by *Lewes the eleventh* written to him from the *Dutcheſſe of Burgundy*, which he ſayes *the Hiſtorian doth not charge with incivilitie, or diſhonour*. And is that the caſe of publiſhing Letters, that paſſed betweene man, and wife, and may ſubjects doe to their King, what Enemies may one to another? The Libeller will ſay yes, for he holds noe ſubordination, though the publiſhers profeſſed the contrary, and would not be thought to have abjured their Alleagiance, or that they tooke their King for their Enemy, but their practices were noe more conſiſtent, then the Libellers Arguments,

The injury offred to the *Kings Mother* was too well knowne to be a *fained ſuſpition or jealoſie in him*, and if they had not been guiltie of that

baſe aſperſion, they would have acquitted themſelves ſome other way, then by the publication, and frequent repetition. The Libeller appeares to glory more in recitall of it, then in the argument, which he can draw from pretence of faining a ſuſpition, and he, that ſuckes any imputations vpon the King out of thoſe letters muſt be a Beetle, not a Bee, and they, that from placing conſtancy to his wife, before the mention of Religion, and law will ſpin a *webb* of determination for the prioritie of affection, have more of the *ſpiders* venom, then the Bees ſweetenes.

They which eſteemed their King, though one man the breath of their noſtrills, thought the nation could not be happy without him, And the late Parliament, whereon the Libeller buildes his faith affirmed in their declarations, *the happines of the Kingdome did ſoe mainely depend on his Majeſt: and the Royall branches of that roote, as in an ordinary way of providence, they would not except it from any other fountaine, or ſtreame.* And are they therefore a nation of Ideots, and miſerable, as he ſayes.

The happines of a nation conſiſts in true Religion, pietie, Iuſtice, prudence temperance, fortitude, contempt of avarice, and ambition. And how ſhall theſe be preſerved in a nation, by the rule of the rabble? And bandying the Government with a racket betweene oppoſite factions, but theſe Rebells with the madd men of Munſter will introduce new Ieruſalem with the deſtruction of their Kings, and Rulers, and the Libeller its like lookes to be a greate ſaint in this terreſtriall Paradiſe, who ſayes *they, in whomeſoever theſe vertues dwell eminently neede not Kings, but are the Architects of their owne happines, and whether to themſelves, or others are not leſſe then Kings.* The world hath been well acquainted with theſe Architects of Treaſon, and ſhall never want pretenders to thoſe vertues, whoſe practice ſhewes them the builders of Babell, that place their happines in their power, and other mens confuſion, the King appeares eminent in theſe vertues, not only by his conſtant actions, but in his houſ hold, which was admired for itts order amongſt ſtrangers above other Courts, though by the Libeller traduced, as all laudable things are.

To *make reconciliation deſperate*, the Libeller holds reaſonable, and aſkes, *why they ſhould feare it*, and ſuch, as intend not reconciliation with God, thinke they have noe neede to be reconciled to men.

Their fact is not parallell to Chams revealing his fathers nakednes, for the King at that time could not be eſteemed the father of his Countrey, nor had ever merited that Title. And might not Cham have ſaid ſoe to his father, aſwell, as doe what he did? But they, who acknowledged that Title due to him, as the Parliament did, and gave it him as their King, cannot excuſe themſelves from a ſin parallell to Chams, nor from the merit of his curſe.

The Libeller profeſſes averſenes to all reconciliation vpon pretence of

of Juſtice to the lives of them, that dyed for the freedome of their Countrey, and yet he will not profeſſe to want Charitie, and why then *is it mockery with God* for the King *to pray, that God will judge his cauſe, and that the evill they intended returne on their owne heads, that they may be aſhamed, and covered with their owne confuſion, as with a cloake* the King forgave his Enemies, but ſtill prayed vnto God for the vindication of his innocencie by the conviction of thoſe falſe accuſers, and this is not to wiſh them that evill, which hinders Charitie, but prayer for that favour of God, which protects innocencie, and that livery of detraction, and confuſion the Libeller will rather weare, then exchange it for the robe of righteouſnes, whoſe malice to the living, not Juſtice to the dead drawes theis hipocriticall pretences from him.

Vpon his

GOING

to the

SCOTTS.

IT was not an excuſe, but a reall intelligence, that the King had of their conſultations at London, *deſigning miſcheife to his perſon, if he came there* The junto did not vſe to proclaime their Counceils, neither was it pretended they did, and though neceſſitie Counſelled the King *to adventure vpon their loyaltie, who firſt begun his troubles*, yet the rigour of the Engliſh Rebells drew on that neceſſitie, and the Kings comming to the Scotts might worke, if there were any remainders of loyaltie *to devide thoſe*, who were only joyned by an vnlawfull, and diſſembled confederacie, and it had not been *an Act of malice*, but prudence to reſolve vpon ſuch an hope, for *friends* they could not be, that are contemned for an *hireling Army, paid not in Scotch coine, but Engliſh ſilver* jeered with their *Brotherly aſſiſtance, and monthly pay*, and a right vnderſtanding of the diſaffection to the Engliſh Rebells towards them, might recall them to their dutie to the king, and withdraw them from their diſloyall combination.

The ſcotts needed not armies to *defend their libertie, & conſcience*, which were never invaded, & the charges were not out of charity to them, but for the neceſſitie of thoſe, who ſent for the ſcotch aſſiſtãce, he il pretẽds a cauſe for the ſcotts *miſtruſt* of the king in that caſe, where a ground of ſuſpitiõ could not be imagined, & judges others by his own obduratiõ,

that loyaltie once broken is rather *tempted* to a finall ſhipwracke, then preſerved by an opportunitie to recover it.

Providence doubtles is never *couſened*, but deceivers, though they falſifie their faith to others muſt expect, that as their falshood was permitted, ſoe it will receive its detection, and demeritts.

The man thinkes much, that their *profeſt loyaltie*, who fought againſt their King ſhould be called a *riddle*, and as it was a very darke one to generall vnderſtanding, ſoe if they had preſerved the Kings perſon being in their power, they had given ſome ſolution doing what they ſaid of their loyaltie, not what their former Actions imported. And doth not the Libeller ſay, its ridiculous, that they, whoſe profeſt loyaltie led them to direct armes againſt the Kings perſon, ſhould thinke him violated by their murther of him, which he calls Juſtice, & who vnderſtands not, that *ſo neceſſitous may be the ſtate of Princes, that their greateſt danger may be in their ſuppoſed ſafetie, and their ſafetie in their ſuppoſed danger.* But he would have, that the only way for the Kings preſervation was to ſacrifiſe his reaſon honour, & conſcience, & not to have run ſuch hazards, though his Majeſt: left his force, he reſolved not to leave his conſcience, and change an *outward for an inteſtine warr*, and Rebells deſiſt not from their violence, whether he ſtrive or yeilde. If he *contend*, he is *bloody*, if he yeilde, he is *wily*, if he offer reaſon, he is *obſtinate*, If he acknowledge, he is *guilty*, and thus the players of a Rebell *game*, having irrecoverably loſt honour, & conſcience play on ſtill to gaine power, & increaſe guilt.

The words of a King are full of power by the law, and that law is not like the *Nazarites locke of ſampſon*, but an anointing they have from God, which is inſeperable, though Rebells like the faithles harlot cut of his force, and Armies, yet the right of his power is inſeperable, and if theſe Traytours had looked to precept, or Example, they might have found, that a Kings word had power, and their perſons reverence without reſpect to the merit of their Actions. David pretended not, that Saul had not authoritie of law, when he perſecuted him without a cauſe, & when Sauls life was in his power. The King appeales not vnto Libellers, and common paſquills to judge of his reaſon, & ſuch', as are offended at the name, or eſtimation of reaſon, are likely to have a ſmall part in it.

Monuments of his reaſon appeare as thinly in his Actions, and writting, as could be expected from the meaneſt parts, bred vp in the middeſt of ſoe many wayes extarordinary to know ſomething. Surely the Monuments of the Libellers irrationall aſſertions appeare very thicke in this whole diſcourſe, and men may be amazed at his folly, that makes him run into ſoe many abſurdities to avoyde the confeſſion of truth, how often hath he objected to the King, that his breeding could not enable him to judge of matters, and heere would advance his breeding to abaſe his parts, but ſuch, as reade the Kings booke, and his will ſee Monuments enough of his Majeſt; reaſon, and the Libellers abſurditie, and impudence.

The

The Kings deliberations touching his leaving Oxford, though mature, yet foreſeene to be of doubtfull event, and therefore vainely obſerved by the Libeller to contradict his prayer. *Though I know not what to doe, yet mine eyes are towards thee.* Wicked men contemne Princes, and God cauſeth them *to wander in the wildernes, where their is noe way.* The puniſhments vpon Princes are moſt frequent for the wickednes of the people, whereby they come to confuſion, and have many rulers, but it was a willfull falſification of the Libellers to cite a Text as ſpoken of Princes, that was altogeather applyed to the people. Pſalme 107.

Vpon the

SCOTTS

Delivering the KING to the

ENGLISH.

THis objecting of ſelling the King by the Scotts is ſoe fowle an infamy, as befitts none to vindicate, but themſelves. In the meane time the Libeller thinkes, he may ſay with the high Prieſts to Judas confeſſing his ſin of betraying our ſaviour, what is that to vs, and he would have the infamy only reſt on the ſeller, none on the buyer, and its like will, as he profeſſes *diſagree* with the King *to the worlds end*, and will *out babble all law, truth, and reaſon*, that ſuch as fought to change the Government, & deſtroy the lawes, fought for them, and he may *babble* to the worlds end, and not be beleived againſt the evidence of the fact, and that *miror* before his face, wherein he ſees all that acted, which he denies, renders him not only a denyer of principles, but common ſenſe, & the Traytours decree of *non addreſſes* was what they ever intended, though they had not a confidence to act it preſently, and from that example of diſloyaltie, the Libeller, & others made a change of principles to ſute with ſuch monſtrous productions. Its probable the Libeller would be ever anſwearing *fruiteles repetitions*, for his anſweares are noe other, and yet he thinkes himſelfe not liable to cenſure for his ſtall repetition in the lines before of the kings *being vnalterable in his will, would have been our Lord, averſe from Parliament, and reformation.*

If the Libeller retained any eſtimation of *Davids heart*, he would not ſoe often have reproached the vſe of Davids words, And we have good reaſon to beleive, that he, that ſuffred Davids troubles, was ſupported

ported with a meaſure of Davids ſpirit, while his perſecuters exerciſed on him the malice of Davids Enemies; And were not this Libeller poſſeſſed with an evil ſpirit, he would not borrow matter of ſport from ſtealing *Davids ſpirit*, nor reproach, and ſlander from *Pamelaes* prayer. which may be vſed more warrantably then reproved, but he is drawne very dry that make ſuch vſe of a ſcoffe.

Vpon the

DENYING

him the attendance of his

CHAPPLAINES.

A *Chapplaine is a thing diminitive, and inconſiderable.* And the man would be ignorantly witty vppon the name, as vnknowne. That a King ſhould not deſire the aſſiſtance of ſuch perſons of the Clergie, as were his Domeſtickes, & acquainted with his conſcience, or that ſuch perſons ſhould not have a place in the families of Kings, may ſeeme a ſtrange ſuppoſition in theſe men, that ſoe much magnifie preaching, as the ſhopps of Mechannickes are turned to pulpitts, and every Cooper growne a reverend Predicant.

The Scripture owneſ noe ſuch function, not of Preſbiter, for what els are Chapplaines, if he had looked for the names of his independent congregations, he had not found them in Scripture. But they, that know noe places dedicated to the ſervice of God, know noe perſons attending that ſervice.

The Church not avowing them, they are left to ſuch further examination, as the Sons of Sceva the Iew mett with. And itts like they meete with ſuch examiners, as the Sons of Sceva mett with, ſuch vncleane ſpiritts, as profeſſed to know Jeſus, and Paul, but hated both, and were the intelligencers of the Prince of Darkenes, and the Libeller in their Phraſe ſayes, *Biſhopps, or Presbiters we know, and Deacons we know, but who are Chapplaines?* He could not have choſen an Example more proper for his imitation, that hates the name, and function of Biſhopps, and Preſbiter, as thoſe wicked ſpiritts the name of Jeſus, and Paul, & thence it is, that he hath gathered the Cobwebs of the ſtage to caſt vpon them, calling the Miniſters of the goſpell *ſewers, and yooman vſhers of devotion*, and *implements of the Court Cup'board*, this is the devotion of theſe reformers.

Their

Their ſending to the King *Miniſters, and others*, whoſe exceſſe of corrupt affections were become venom, and fury againſt all loyaltie, was to render his condition more afflicted being only allowed to live among ſcorpions, and have his habitation with Dragons, who were not only inſolent Traytours, but *diminitive*, and inconſiderable *Creatures* for a Religious charge. They denyed him his Chapplaines in affront, and to encreaſe the meaſure of his ſufferings, and ſuch, as feele not the abſence of thoſe Meſſengers of peace, which God hath appointed to bring glad tidings to his people, diſcover more prophanes, then *Michha* ſuperſtition, and his ignorance condemnes the preſumptuous pretence to knowledge in thoſe Rebells: he lamented the loſſe of his Levite, in whome, thoug erroneouſly, he thought himſelfe bleſt in regard of his Tribe, theſe men thinke Biſhopps, and Preſbiters of noe more vſe, then Micahs Idoll, for the Libeller would not have *houſhold oraiſons officiated by Prieſts*, but where are Prieſts forbidden that office. Theſe men, that have ſoe long vſed houſhold Conventicles, and had their wandring Levites to officiate, now know noe vſe of them.

Kings heeretofore, David, Solomon, and Iehoſophat might not touch the Prieſthood, yet might pray in publique, while the Prieſts ſtood, and heard. And doth it follow from the practice of theſe particular perſons, that publique prayer was not a part of the Prieſts office, he might aſwell conclude from the prayers of the publican, and Phariſee, becauſe they were made in the temple, and the King did vpon good grounds, beleive, a particular bleſſing on the Prieſts prayers, as on his ſermons, though *God admit all men to call vpon him*: And the Libeller ſhewes with what Zeale thoſe Sectaries call vpon God, with whome the Prieſts prayers are *the chewing of Mattins*, and yet theis Enemies of God will be called Chriſtians, whoſe whole language is the deriſion of all devotion Though the King had abilities of knowledge to pray beyound their mimicke levites, yet he would neither vſurpe the Prieſts office, nor neglect the vſe of it in confidence of his owne parts, and the Monſters he mentions, its like would preach repentance for not ſinning, and would as eaſily preach downe true repentance, as preach vp Rebellion, and the King had reaſon to give ſuch conſpiratours the ſame welcome, that Solomon did to Abiathar, that abetted the Treaſon of Adoniah, And he could not hope, that Joroboams Prieſts, who were made of the loweſt of the people, and ſupported the revolt from their lawfull King would teach other doctrine, then what tended to ſubverſion of Church, and ſtate. We have ſeene, that with the ſacriledge of the endowments of the Church, the Rebells have ſet vp their Images of Prieſts, and have baniſht all devotion, and ſervice of God cenſuring the ſaying of *amen* to a devout prayer for a ſuperſtitious reſponſorie.

The prayers made by the forenamed Kings in the Temple, and by the

Apoſtles, and ancient Chriſtians for above three hundred yeares were in vaine, if the heart cannot ſafely joyne with another mans extemporall ſufficiency. And whence doth it appeare, that any of theſe prayers, that were made for others to joyne in, were made vpon extemporall ſufficiency, the contrary appeares, when the Scripture expreſſely dictates the words, which the Prieſt ſhall vſe, whereto the people muſt ſay Amen, & there is not any ſtory, from whence the want of Leiturgies in the firſt age of the Church can be collected, but there are Teſtimonies of their antiquitie, aswell, as neceſſitie of their vſe. Its a ſigne of a prophane heart, that makes his mirth, of *divinitie*, and a very litle witt goes to the conceites of a *cloſett Chapplaine, and a minde wandring after preferment, or his dinner in the time of prayer.* Doubtles he eſteemes a dinner more, then devotion, that places the ſumme of his Religion in affected, and ſcorneful ſuppoſitions of other mens intentions.

He aſkes, *what avayles their praying with him.* And why ſhould men joyne in prayer at all, is there noe efficacie in ſuch conjuncture? We may not doubt both of aſſiſtance in our prayers, and bleſſing vpon them by joyning with our ſpirituall Fathers in that dutie, and he, that hath moſt *oyle in his owne lampe*, will ſeeke encreaſe of it by thoſe diſpenſers, which God hath appointed.

The libellers objections are not like *thoſe apples of Aſphaltis*, whereto he compares the Kings diſcourſes, but like thoſe foggs, and Miſts, which ariſe out of a putrified matter, and are offenſive to the eyes, whome they would hinder from beholding the ſun, and are inſtantly diſpelled with the ſame heate, that moved them.

Many things were ſung in the Kings Chappell, that were not vnderſtood. It may be by ſome men, that would not, but ſuch, as could vnderſtand what was read, might vnderſtand what was ſung in the Kings Chappell, there being neither ſtrange language, nor note to make any thing vnintelligible.

His beleife is, that *God is noe more moved with a prayer elaborately penned, then men truly Charitable with the penned ſpeech of a beggar.* There is no doubt of it, if there want devotion in him, that vſes it, but what difference is there betweene a prayer elaborately penned, and haſtily conceived, is God more moved with extemporall, then elaborate expreſſions, and are not the tunes of their new Levites too neere the ſound of Common beggars to be eſteemed a fruite of devotion by the hearers?

ΕΙΚΩΝ ΑΚΛΑΣΤΟΣ

Vpon his Penitentiall vowes,

AND

MEDITATIONS

AT

HOLMEBY.

HOw long the Sectaries have made the frequent vſe of places of Scripture in their prayers, the markes of their devotion neede not be remembred, and now the vſe of places of Scripture muſt be hipocriſie in the King. His devotions muſt be perſecuted aswell, as his Eſtate, and perſon, and the Libeller had wanted one principle brand of infamy, if he had omitted thoſe cenſures of the kings pietie vpon pretence of the practice of hipocrites, and wicked men, and he will accuſe the Godly, becauſe wicked men have diſſembled, & ſett parallell the cleereſt devotions of the ſaints of God to the expreſſions of the moſt deſperate, and execreable ſinners, he will prove the King ſhort of true repentance, which is a ſubject vndiſcernable by a man of reſolved impenitency, God only knowes the truth of the heart, and ſuch, as turne Charitie into curſing are as farr from a right vnderſtanding of others vprightnes, as conſcious of their owne hipocriſy.

He produces vpon the Kings imitation, and vſe of Davids Pſalmes the ſayings *of Cain, Eſau, Pharaoh, Balaam, Saul, Ahab, Iehoram, Iudas, and Simon Magus.* That we may not doubt, but the ſame malice raignes in this rayler, that appeared in theſe hipocrites, and he might have found, that this courſe, which he takes in ſlandring the king was as frequent in former perſecuters, as good words in the mouths of hipocrites, the Rebells againſt Moſes charged him with vſurpation, and impoſture, ſaying, will thou putt out the eyes of theſe men, Davids Enemies cryed fy on thee we ſaw it with our eyes, Job was charged to drinke downe iniquitie like water, John the Baptiſt to have a Divell, and our bleſſed ſaviour to be a glutton, and a wine bibber. Vertue, nor abilitie never wanted detraction, & a juſt eſteeme of one, or other may not be expected from men, that have neither, for if they had eyther, they would not ſett themſelves againſt both, he deales, as the Phariſees to watch the words of our Saviour to gett a word for their accuſation

of him, and ſoe the Libeller to cover the ſhame of his wicked cauſe, catches at the Kings words to putt of the guilt of their Rebellion, and makes it Gods diſpoſing to that purpoſe, that the King ſayes *lett thy anger I beſeech thee be againſt me, and my Fathers houſe, as for theſe ſheepe, what have they done?* And by this ſayes he *acquitts the Parliament, and people, and takes the ſin on himſelfe, as David did.* Noe doubt he tooke on him his owne ſins, for which God brought on him his affliction, but doth he thereby juſtifie his bloody perſequuters, though he were punisht by a Rebellion, doth he acquitt the Rebells? Doth he meane wolves, whē he names ſheepe? The King expreſſes his Fatherly pitty to his innocent ſubjects, and the Libeller his emptines of defence in aſſuming ſoe impertinent an inference, as if David could not acknowledge Gods Juſtice in the Rebellion of Abſolom without the acknowledgment of his wicked Sons righteouſnes, nor the King vſe Davids confeſſion of Gods Juſtice vpon occaſion of the preſent puniſhment of the people by the ſword, and his proofe is ſuteable to his collection, for he ſayes *in the next line, he accuſes the Church it ſelfe for the Churches Enemy.* The next line is, *let my ſuffrings ſatiate the malice of mine, and the Churches Enemies*, ſure the man would have his independent brethren the only true Church, that are the Enemies of it, their victories are by *Miracle*, and what then are the Turkes, which were greater, and more ſtrange then theirs? And let any man compare the boaſtings of the Rebells with the Enemies of Gods Church in all times, and there will appeare the greateſt likenes, that hath been obſerved in men driven by Diabolicall inſtinct, & thence proceedes the Libellers diſtemper, that having within ſoe few lines before ſought to hide their Rebellion, cannot retaine the motives of it, and thoſe he expreſſes to be *libertie of ſchiſmes, the abolition of Biſhepps, eſtabliſht lawes, Kingly power, and leiturgy*, the oppreſſing of loyaltie getting all force into the Rebells hands, and to withſtand them heerein is *Tyrany*.

He reſembles their ſacriledge to *Davids eating the ſhewbread, and Ezechiahs taking the gold, and ſilver out of the Temple.* But did David make a warr to deſtroy the Prieſts, that he might eate the ſhewbread, or Hezechiah ſeeke to deſtroy the Temple, that he might take away the ſilver, and gold? And the primitive Church ſold their ſacred vtenſills to preſerve their Prieſts, & Biſhopps, not ſought to take them away, that they might convert the ſacred vtenſills to their private avarice, and the Biſhopps ſold thoſe ſacred vtenſills, neither Princes, nor people durſt lay their hands on them.

The Libeller will not endure any glory to be given to God, but by the *medly* of Sectaries, nor any *reſtitution of the King, to his cheife Cittie*, but with the ſpilling of his blood, and thoſe that were faithfull to him. In the beginning of Chriſtianitie men had to doe with Pagans, who oppoſed Religion directly, and in this age wee have to doe with men, that

that would betray it to Pagans, by obtruding ſuch doctrines, and practice for Chriſtian, which may make it odious to morall heathens, who could only heeretofore queſtion the truth of our beleife, but may by theis new reformers take occaſion to accuſe our Religion of impietie, for theſe wretches repreſent it contrary to all the principles of Common honeſtie. The Rebells cannot beleive a pardon, they know their demeritts ſoe execrable, and therefore he will ſuppoſe the King would finde meanes to puniſh, though he promiſed pardon. They know the falſhood of their owne hearts, and thence is their ſuſpition. This libeller is not to be diſputed with vpon principles of Religion, that receives noe Maximes, but of Rebellion, and Tyrany, God graunts not allwayes deliverance to his Servants from temporall evills, though they pray for them, and this prophane Libeller concludes their prayers to be fained, becauſe not graunted, his words are fitt for deteſtation, and therefore to be obſerved by al, that they may abhorre the blacke miſteries of this ſect, for he ſayes, *God having cut him of without graunting any of thoſe mercyes, it followes, that his reſolutions were as fained, as his vowes fruſtrate.* What Turke, Jew, or devill could ſay more againſt ſuffring Chriſtians.

Vpon the

ARMIES

ſurpriſall of the KING at

HOLMBY.

THe lowde noyſe, that the Libeller hath made hitherto of the greate obſtinacy of the King in not hearkning to the advice of Parliament is ended, and the Parliament become a Councell of ſcribes, and Phariſees, and they had been elder Brothers long enough, and it was now time, that the younger ſhould have his turne, and the new modell muſt dictate to the doting Parliament, and there muſt not be a *prevalence* in the houſe of Commons to diſcard thoſe men of *invincible valour without their due reward*, and though they may murder the King, having taken away his ſword, they may not thinke to deale ſoe with them, that have the ſword in their hands. *The virulence of ſome falſe Miniſters*, which the King muſt not name without reverence, and their *ſeditious tongues more Zealous againſt ſchiſme, then Simony, or pluralities might in likelyhood have done miſcheife betweene* theis Brethren, but *it was prevented*,

and in deſpight of the Parliament, and theſe old warriours, and Zealous Miniſters, the new modell *ſeize the King their Captive*, and this is the law, Religion, Reformation, Libertie, and Parliament, which the king withſtood, and the man after all his law determines, that *irregular motions may be neceſſary on earth ſometimes aswell, as in heaven. Greate worthyes by diſobeying law oft times have ſaved the Commonwealth, and the law afterward approved that vnblameable exorbitancie.* But wherefore hath he all this time made breach of lawes ſoe hainous, it had been ingenuous in him to have diſtinguiſhed betweene the blameable, and vnblameable exorbitancy, & then he would not have found Coate, & Conduct-money, and the reſt of his particulars riſe ſoe high, as the vnblameable exorbitancies he now magnifies. But though Divine lawes could not regulate the mans motions, as they doe Celeſtiall bodyes, yet the obſtinacy in his evil courſes makes him goe retrograde, and fight for law, and againſt law, for Parliament, and againſt Parliament, and truſt, and Elections in Parliament are become ſcarecrowes to fright Children, not Conquerours.

Though the Preſbiterian be ſupplanted, he ſhall finde a better portion, then vncircumciſed Prelates. Its like the Jewiſh brethren ſeeke to bring into bondage ſuch, as receive not their Antichriſtian Markes, and profeſſe the beleife of revived hereſies, eating the ſacrifices of the dead. The ſtory could not certifie the King, that there was *diviſion* of tongues, or hands *in the builders of Ieruſalem*, but it told him, that they, which built had the Kings Commiſſion, and God may in mercy to the nation remove theis bloody brethren, that will deſtroy Jeruſalem rather then quit their Tyrany over it. We may very well ſee the judgment of God vpon the nation in this bloody warr, and though it begun with the houſe of God, we may expect, that ſuch men will not eſcape, that have been the firebrands of this diſſention, and wrought ſoe greate miſery vpon the nation, and though the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites gloried in the Jewes Captivitie, as theis Rebells in the Conqueſt, and Captivitie of their King, and *Sanballat*, and Tobiah, and theſe other Enemies of the Church deſpiſed the weakenes of the Jewes in rebuilding the wall of Jeruſalem, and in ſcorne ſaid, that a fox going on it would overthrow it ſpeaking with the ſame inſolencie, as the Libeller now vſes, yet they may be aſſured, that God will remember his Church, and the Enemies thereof, as he did Edom in the day of Jeruſalem.

The Libeller is a good witnes againſt himſelfe, ſaying *to counterfeite the hand of God is the boldeſt of all forgeries, and he, who without warrant, but his owne fantaſtique ſurmiſe takes vpon him perpetually to vnfold the ſecret, and vnſearchable miſterie of high providence, is likely for the moſt part to miſtake, and ſlander them, and approaches to the madnes of thoſe reprobate thoughts, that would wreſt the ſword of Iuſtice out of Gods owne hand, and apply it more juſtly in his conceite*, and himſelfe makes the application, that vſurpes the

the hand of God in the ſucceſſes, and victories of Rebells to the approbation of their impietie, and avow, the wreſting of the ſword of Juſtice out of the hand of Gods vicegerent to imploy it more juſtly in their owne conceite, and dares ſlander the miſteries of high providence by binding them to their owne fantaſtique ſurmiſes; What could he have ſpoken more appoſitely to his owne condemnation? All men, that behold the dealings of the Army with that mocke Parliament, doe judge a very greate proportion in that retalliation of the injuries, they had offred the King, & they, that would lay hands on the Militia are brought vnder the Dominion of thoſe forces, which themſelves had rayſed for that vſurpation, and heere againe the Libeller would finde ſomewhat to ſuccour his feeble conceites of the beginning of the warr from the Kings confeſſion, which ſayes, *noe man is ſoe blinde, as not to ſee herein the hand of divine Iuſtice, they, that by Tumults firſt occaſioned the rayſing of Armes, muſt now be Chaſtened with their owne Army for new Tumults.* And what now is the Libellers extraction from hence, that becauſe *Tumults were the firſt occaſion of rayſing Armes, by conſequence he himſelfe rayſed them firſt againſt theſe Tumults.* Its a cripled cauſe, that ſtands on ſuch crutches. Though Tumults might be the firſt occaſion, yet this was not the whole occaſion, for theſe Tumults were ſeconded by ſeizing the forts, and Navy, & rayſing an Army by thoſe, that rayſed the Tumults, and their guilt in rayſing Tumults, ſought protection from a formed Army, and this Method of divine Juſtice, ſober men obſerve with reverence, while irrationall, and obſtinate Traytours attribute nothing, but their owne ſucceſſes to the hād of God in favour, which is in wrath to themſelves, and others.

Theſe were new Tumults, for which the Citie was chaſtened, and cannot be referred to another farr fercht cauſe ſoe many yeares before. But the Cittie, that rayſed Tumults for the Parliament many yeares before, is now puniſht for Tumults, for that ſame pretended Parliament by that Army rayſed out of them, and is it not evident heere that the firſt inventers of miſcheife, are ſcourged with the whipps themſelves had prepared for others.

The fact of Manlius defending the Capitoll againſt the Gaules, and afterward throwne headlong from the Capitoll for ſedition, might reſtraine the Libellers wicked application of their murdering the King at the gate of whitehall to the merit of his actions done there, but the Cittie ſuffred by an Action, which they had done for them, who now puniſh them for it, and they, that did a wickednes with applauſe, are puniſht for it by thoſe that applauded it, the Actions of Manlius were oppoſite one to another, heere the ſame.

It was a mercy they had a victorious Army ſoe neere to fly to. But it was a judgment, that Tumults, which they had vſed to drive away the King, ſhould drive away them, and the Libellers Logickes ſerves him to as litle

litle purpoſe, as his hiſtorie, He would have, that the latter were reall Tumults, the firſt but pretended, and why will he beleive the Parliament for the firſt, and not for the latter? And why doth he call them *thoſe few* of both houſes, that withdrew from the firſt tumults, and *thoſe many* from the latter, when it is moſt apparent, that they, which withdrew at firſt were three times the number of them, that forſoake at laſt.

It is not the place, but the end, and cauſe, that makes a Parliament. And then all they, that ſay they have a good cauſe, and a good end are a Parliament, and what neede is there then of a writ, or Elections? And Tumults are as good, as Parliaments, and the end, and the cauſe make them Tumults, and noe Tumults, Parliament and noe Parliament, and an Aſſembly at the beare garden is as good, as the houſe of Commons, he hath found the event to ſalve all, for *they returned ſoone to their places*, that fled from theſe latter Tumults, and that is the finall deciſion of all controverſie.

The King brings in an inconvenient, and obnoxious Compariſion of vengeance, as the Mice, and Ratts overtooke a german Biſhopp. And the inconvenience is, that the Libeller will from the name of Biſhopp wiſh the ſame evill to all Biſhopps, that befell, that evill Biſhopp. Is the compariſion obnoxious, becauſe he is impertinent in following his owne ſhaddow, and curſing thoſe, that are innocent. Is it obnoxious, that the King ſupporting the order of Biſhopps ſhould produce the Example of an evill Biſhopp followed by divine vengeance? Is not the Libellers mentioning the ſeditious tongues of his falſe preachers more obnoxious, then the naming of the German Biſhopp? And is it not as eaſy to wiſh the Ratts, and mice had purſued theis falſe, and ſeditious preachers till they had driven them out of the land, as the Biſhopps?

Sorrow, and pittie in an overmaſtred Enemy are looked vpon, as the aſhes of his revenge burnt out vpon it ſelfe. An over maſtred Enemy may be more, then Conquerour, and may have cauſe, and affection to pittie the victor, and they moſt neede pittie, that leaſt feele the want. The Triumphs of Rebells are vnnaturall Prodigies, and the dances of devills. The pittie of innocent Martirs, which they expreſſed for proud perſecutours was lookt on, as the Kings by theſe villaines, and the wicked Jewes deſpiſed our ſaviours bidding them not weepe for him, but for themſelves, and for their Children. Although the Libeller ſoe lately juſtified chaſtning of the Parliament, yet he will have it an injury in the King to perſwade men againſt the Parliament, and ſoe he ties the end, and the cauſe to what he pleaſes, and as long, as he can bring noe better evidence, then the ſucceſſe of vſurpation, he waſhes not of any guilt from himſelfe, nor his rowte.

The *juſt prayſes of an Enemy* are eſteemed honourable, & knowne truths cannot proceede from Craft, being ſoe obvious to all, and it were neerer to madnes, then reaſon to ſuppoſe, that there were not among thoſe, which

which acted againſt the king, ſuch as knew not what they did, and had as greate ignorance, as the Libeller impudence, that cenſures the Charitie of a prayer for ſuch perſons.

Intitled to the

PRINCE OF VVALES.

THe Libeller vndertakes to ſhew, that *although the King had been reinſtalled to his deſire, or his ſonne admitted ſhould obſerve all his fathers precepts, yet that would be ſoe farr from conducing to our happines, that it would inevitably throw vs backe againe into all our paſt, and fulfilled miſeries.* There is noe doubt, but Traytours will tell the people ſoe, and that there is noe happines, but vnder their vſurpation, and though they engage them in endles warrs, which the rebelling againſt juſt right muſt produce, yet they perſwade the people, that the condition of warr, and blood is more eligible, then thoſe bleſſings of peace the Kingdome enjoyed vnder all their Princes. By our happines he intends doubtles his Rebell partie, whoſe happines is to raigne, and Tyranize over the people, and that cannot continue with reinſtalling the King. But the people of England expect not any end of their miſerie, but by reſtoring the juſt rights of their lawfull King, and they now deſcerne, that the ſucceſſe of a wicked cauſe was a judgment of God vpon the nation, whoſe vnthankefullnes, for their long proſperitie had juſtly provoked his wrath.

He goes on to his proofes, that *the king beares wittnes in his owne words, that the corrupt education of his youth was not vntruly charged vpon him, or his Sonne*, and that he gathers from theſe words of the Kings, *Court delights are prone either to roote vp all true vertue, and honour, or to be contented only with ſome leaves, and withering formalities of them without any reall fruites tending to the publique good.* And is it a proofe, that becauſe Court delights are prone to produce ſuch fruites therefore all, that live in Princes Courts muſt neceſſarily have a corrupt education, & might not this Libeller have cleerely obſerved, that his Majeſt: was free from ſuch a corrupt education, that had ſoe cleere a ſight of the ill conſequences of Court delights. Though there be theſe pleaſures at the Court, it is not the education of Princes, whoſe youth is ſeaſoned by inſtruction againſt the corruption of theſe baites. There are dangers to mens manners from abundance, and high places, and thence the Libeller would inferr, that there muſt neither be wealth, nor power, but in the hands of his Phariſaicall Sectaries, who never complaine of ſuch corruption. The deſperate hipocriſie of theſe traytours is laid opē by their owne words, and Actions, and the Libeller from the Kings caution to his Sonne by the example of Rehoboam frames an expreſſion, as if the King affirmed

it to be his owne caſe, with ſuch faithleſſe dealing he addreſſes himſelfe to his heedeles readers, and tells all that he ſayes, is the Kings confeſſion. There are doubtles men, that can relate the *Kings life*, & will, but that neede not in oppoſition to the ſlanders of Rebells, whoſe cauſe is ſupported by the lewdenes of detraction. The long peace of the Kings Raigne, in the midſt of warrs round about vs, ſhewes, he was not idle in performance of the *Kingly office*, and the warr, and miſerie, that ſince brake out, was the effect of greate proſperitie, which, as it corrupts the Court of Princes, ſoe the mindes of the people, and makes way for the deſignes of ſeditious Traytours, we had been ſure to have heard ſlander enough vpon the Kings perſonall behaviour, if he had been obnoxious to any ſuſpition, or tainted with Court delights. The beſt Governments are ſubject to repinings, and the greate proſperietie of Solomons Raigne, when ſilver for the plentie was not eſteemed, drew after it popular Complaints of heavy burdens, and whatever Rehoboam threatned, Jeroboam really performed, the madnes of the people finding allwayes their murmurings repayed with greater ſufferings. The diſobedience, and contempt of juſt authoritie, and of thoſe principles of Government, and Religion, which the King teaches his Son have been the occaſion of al our miſeries, there being nothing like miſerie, or ſuffring before this horrid Rebellion.

And now the Libeller will have *the breeding op of his Majeſt: now living in the rugged, and boyſterous licence of vndiſciplined Camps, and garriſons noe better, then the effeminacies of the Court*, and yet he will perſwade vs, that Rebells nurſed vp in that boyſterous, and vnnaturall diſobedience are fitteſt inſtruments of our happines. Thoſe principles, which the King had learnt in his education, and which endured the Tryall of a fierie adverſitie are received for ſound by all ſuch, as have not renounced reverence to Religion. Thoſe principles, which the proſecution of a bloody Rebellion, and the continuall exerciſe of rapine, falſhood, & oppreſſion, have fixed in the hearts of Rebells muſt neceſſarily make the words of the wiſe, & the wayes of the juſt, matter only of contempt, and deriſion, and ſuch, as have once broken the bounds of modeſtie, thinke it diſhonour to have ſhame, and repentance, and will advance their confuſions inſteede of order, their Blaſphemies for zeale, their ſacriledge for reformation, their Tyrany for law, and all the hell they feare is the loſſe of their vſurped power, and the reſtoring of juſt right, and their jealoſies of looſing their owne greatenes provokes them ſtill to an increaſe of their lewdenes, making truth, and right the object of their ſpite, and perſecution. Theſe debaucht Rebells proclaime, that there is noe good but Rebellion, noe worke of God, but ſubmiſſion to it, and repentance for oppoſing it.

If the *Church of England be Antipapall*, how comes it to be a *ſchiſme*? And why hath the libeller ſo continually made vp his diſcourſes with in-

inclinations to Popery? Independencie knowes noe ſchiſme, for if it allow every meeting its libertie, where is the ſchiſme?

Its a Rule, that noe Scripture, nor ancient Creede bindes our faith to any Church denominated by a particular name. But he rejects, what was receiued by the vniverſall Church. What doth that contradict the Kings advice to his Son of his eſteeme of the Church of England, if he beleive, as he did vpon good ground, that it was agreeable in doctrine to the word of God? It is apparent, that theſe Sectaries are ſeperated from all Churches of the world, and that Government, which they call Catholique had neither precept, nor practice in any Church, being newly crept out of hell to perſecute the Church.

Noe man was ever bid to be ſubject to the Church of Cornith, Rome, or Aſia, but to the Church without addition. And why doth he deny to be ſubject to the Church without addition, was there never Church before this day? heere we have the builders of Babell, none vnderſtand what another ſayes, were not thoſe that lived in thoſe Churches of Corinth, Rome, & Aſia commaunded to be ſubject to the Governours of thoſe Churches? Is it not the Apoſtles Commaund to obey thoſe, that have the overſight of them, and may every man deſpiſe their new independent congregations, & ſeeke for a Church without addition, and where then will he finde him? We may imagine what manner of ſtate ſuch Church reformers will erect, and what it is they call reformation, that looke vpon all Churches, as ſchiſmes, becauſe not rent into as many parts, as particular perſons. Theſe ſchismatickes pretend the Church of England *allmoſt growne Popiſh*, and yet nothing altered from the firſt reformation, & while they diſguiſe their meaning by pretending popery to gett the vulgar vnawares to favour their diſſembled zeale, they demaund to have the Reformation *vneſtabliſhed*. And the reſtraint of their Rebellion is *Pharaohs prohibition* to the Iſraelites, that ſought leave toſacrifiſe to God. It was a greate teſtimony of the Kings zeale to the Church of God, that he forewarned his Sonne to ſuppreſſe errours, & ſchiſmes, his owne experience having taught him, that theſe doggs, and evill workers are the greateſt evills to Church, and ſtate, and theſe deſtroyers, that are the reproaches of Religion, the Scabbs, and biles to the Church, allow noe proteſtant Churches to be communicated with, that are not tainted with the ſame putrifaction, that hath corrupted them.

For the Civill ſtate the kings precepts tend to the preſervation of Civill libertie, and it was farr from our *Fathers* to thinke, that any humane lawes were *immutable*, but further, that lawes ſhould be altered at the will of a mutable multitude, and that their King ſhould be excluded from the judgment of the reaſons for a change. He falls from the queſtion touchinge repeale of lawes, and talkes of ſaving the Kingdome, we may better truſt the King with ſaving the Kingdome, then

any number of men we can picke out, whoſe private fortunes may be ſaved, though the kingdome be loſt.

The Turkes, Iewes, and Moores enjoy vnder the Turkiſh Government, what their induſtrie, and labour have made their owne. If that be true the Libeller is much out of the way to thinke it a reproach to Civill Government to compare it to the Turkes; what Civill libertie doth the freeſt nation claime more, and what doe theſe Maſters of the new Republique pretend to allow more? Doe they not plainely tell the people, they ought to have noe more, then they will give them? Thus he will defend the Turke, Jew, and Moore rather then be an Engliſhman.

There is noe doubt, but the libertie of the ſubject depends *on the Regall power in the firſt place.* There is noe libertie without Government, and where the Government is regall, the ſubject muſt maintaine it, or be a Traytour, and give vp his libertie for a prey to ravenous vſurpers.

That *the King ſuffred it to be preached in his owne hearing, that the ſubject had noe propertie of his goods, but all was the Kings right.* Is a mainfeſt vntruth, yet they, which make advantage of ſuch inventions practiſe what they reproach, for doth not that thing they call a Parliament, conſiſting of a few contemptible perſons profeſſe, that all the goods of the ſubjects are at their diſpoſing. By the lawes of England noe act can be a law without the king, though both houſes propounded it, and in that negative voyce of the kings, the people repoſed their libertie, which they would not wholly intruſt to a Major part of one, or both houſes.

The power of the whole nation is vertually in the Parliament. But there is noe vertue in it without the king. And is it vertually in ſuch a part of the Parliament, as either the Army, or the Tumults ſhall picke out? The Libeller hath borne wittnes for the kings Martirdome, though he intended the contrary, and while he names the Rebells war in their owne defence, cannot avoyde to tell the world, the Rebellion was to take away the Kings negative voyce, and eſtabliſh lawes at their owne will. Every man will beare wittnes, that it is Martirdome to die, rather then burne incenſe to Idolls, or Devills, and he that refuſes to introduce ſchiſme, and diſorder into the Church, and committ ſacrilegious pillage of Church goods, and is perſecuted to death for his refuſall, is noe leſſe a Martir, then he, that ſuffers for denying an Idolatrous worſhipp, and this is not to die for Religion, becauſe eſtabliſht, but that eſtabliſhment, which we ought to preſerve, and all the painting, & dawbing of theſe Artiſans of Rebellion will not deface that Martirdome, which their owne wicked hands have teſtified. There are no reformed Churches, that have aboliſht the Decalogue, & ſo long a king, that dies by a wicked Rebellion for not conſenting to Trayterours demaunds is judged a Martir by the *beſt reformed Churches*, but he does not looke

looke before he leape, that brings in the *Romiſh Prieſts executed for that, which had been eſtabliſhed*, for he might have knowne they were executed by lawes in force, and for doing what noe law in force allowed, and there is a great deale of difference betweene heretickes dying for errours againſt vniverſall truths, and Martirs dying for vniverſally received truths.

The legiſlative Parliament, and law of Coronation, and obſtinacie of one man his ſoe often chewed Rhetorique will not aide him to overcome ſo apparent truth, and noe *Parliament* could have been ſoe *ridiculous, and contemptible* a thing, as they, which abuſe the name have now made it, ſpurning it too, and fro like a footeball at the will of the multitude, and noe men are more *markes for ſlaves*, then ſuch, as are deſtined to ſuch a vaſſallage vnder ſuch Maſters.

Noe tolleration can pleaſe ſchiſmatickes, that is bounded with any lawes, and vnles they have a libertie to treade downe all law, and Religion, they account it not freedome, and ſuch tolleration, which other Churches account themſelves happy in, theſe Sectaries account deſpicable, that will have it not beneath the honour of a Parliament, and free nation to receive a Schiſmaticall pretended Religion, deviſed by a junto of Mechannickes.

His *ſuſpitions of palliation* are of the ſame ſtuffe with his poſitions, and we may well thinke vpon his owne grounds, that the Kings advice to his Son *to be tender of the people*, was ſincere, *whoſe deſtruction would be his vndoing*. Which might juſtly move a Prince to that tendernes. Powerfull Rebells are noe leſſe infamous, then greate, and theſe, who place the hopes of immortall prayſe in the exceſſe of villanies, only erect the Monuments of their impieties the higher, that they may be ſeene by poſteritie, though they avoyded for the preſent the heigth of Hamans Gallowes, and we may not thinke ſuch men looke to be remembred in mercy with God, who ſhewed none to men. They thinke with Cain their ſin greater, then can be forgiven.

Although the King Exhort his Son *not to ſtudy revenge*, yet they beleive, that *he, or at leaſt they about him intend not to follow that exhortation*, and *that* he ſayes *was ſeene lately at the Hague*. Its like he intends, the killing of Doriſlans their Rebell Agent. Is that an Argument of ſtudying revenge after Reconciliation, that a profeſt villaine was ſlaine in the heate of indignation, comming in Triumph with the blood of the Murthred King, as his Trophey? The Libeller would willingly perſwade the multitude, that it concernes them aſmuch, as thoſe impious projectours of Rebellion to feare ſuch revenge, and therefore they may not repent, but like himſelfe maintaine Treaſon to be the better cauſe, and to returne to loyaltie were *ficklenes, and inſtabilitie*.

He cannot endure the Government by Biſhopps, for he ſayes, *it is*

away

away to ſubdue the conſciences of vulgar men to ſlaviſh doctrine. The doctrine he meanes is order, and obedience, and he would have a compendious way to ſchiſme, and Rebellion, and thats the grudge, which Traytours have at this Government, and their profeſt quarrell.

He will not admit, that *Parliaments can have freedome, if the King may deny any thing, which a Major part propounds*, as if they had noe freedome, vnles the prevailing partie were abſolute Lords, and yet their freedome is preſerved, though the Army picke out a few to be the Parliament, and ſend packing the reſt, and this is the foundation of the Engliſh freedome, as he would have it, and that this Conventicle muſt have the name of Parliament, and not of a faction. The concluſion, that the Libeller would have is, that the Parliament ſhould conſiſt of a few Traytorous deſigners, to whoſe voyce the reſt muſt be only an *Eecho*, and the ſound of a Parliament muſt be noe other, then a bagpipe, yeilding only ſuch noates, as the breath, and ſtopps of the prime Maſters allow it. We have ſeene thoſe *tapiſtry Parliaments*, which he mentions, which ſtay, and remove at the pleaſure of thoſe Maſters of the houſhold; And ſhould not the King have a power to ſtopp the extravagant motions of theſe impetuous Commaunders, which blaſted all ſuch, whoſe wiſedome, and gravitie offred wholeſome Counſells for publique ſafetie, and ordered their *mutes*, and *noughts* to ſignifie their pleaſure The Kingdome would be ſure of miſerie, as often, as they ſee a Parliament, and the people ſee they muſt ſeeke their preſervation in vnitie, which is Reſident in the head, not in thoſe broken fractions the ſubject of diviſion, and ſuch, as ſeeke *vents, and ouletts* from the ſupreame Government are the whirle windes of miſery, and confuſion, but Traytours would have lawes as eaſily broken, as the ſpiders webb. And this Parliament, to which the King muſt be ſubject, himſelfe will allow noe more freedome, then to ſit in the *nooſe* of their Military generall, which when he pleaſes to *draw to geather with one twitch*, not only with his negative, but poſitive Commaud, ſhall *throtile the whole nation to the wiſh of Caligula in one necke*, and this the Kings negative was farr from, and if the Libeller ſtitch togeather all the quibbles of paſquills, & ſatirs, they will agree vnto his Rebell Maſters, but loſe their propertie by his application to lawfull Government. Where they have placed the *Militia* the Kingdome now feele, who vnderſtood not the word, when they were at firſt hoodminckt by it to ſeeke they knew not what.

The *deliverance*, which theſe men boaſt of is the deprivation of juſt Government, and the ſubſtitution of lawles will, and the people ſee, that they are ſoe farr from a *deliverance*, that they are delivered over to a languiſhing miſerie vnder the ſharpeſt ſervitude, and they now finde their Idolizing a Parliament hath drawne them from their loyaltie to him, whome God had ſet over them, and caſt them vnder the hard bondage of theſe Maſters, and like them, which rejected the ſonns of Gideon,

deon, and tooke the ſonne of his ſervant to raigne over them, they feele a fire of diviſion kindled among them to devoure one another.

This Libeller allowes not any thoughts of revenge in his Majeſt: now living for the murder of his father, and yet reproacheth him for making *peace with the Iriſh*, and not ſeeking their totall extirpation, and the peace with them he calls *a ſordid, diſhonourable, and irreligious ſeeking of his Crowne.* But the man is vnwilling he ſhould have any wayes at al, and would perſwade his Sectaries, for none els will beleive him, that the King may not make peace with a Rebell ſubmitting to oppoſe a Rebell perſevering.

That *the Preſbiter Scott, which woes the King now living is put of* proceedes from his termes, not from his qualitie. Should not the people of England ſeeke the reſtitution of their King, and legall Government, whereof they have been cheated with the adulterate oſtentations of libertie, and redreſſe of greivances, they would appeare arrant beaſts, that cryed out, and below'd by the inſtinct of their drivers, fighting *like brutes*, till they ran into the *pinfold*, where they are reſerved for ſervitude, and ſlaughter by thoſe Maſters, who allured them with foode to put the yoake on their neckes.

The Libeller diſlikes the kings concluſion, that *Religion to God, and loyaltie to the King cannot be parted without the ſinne, & infelicitie of a people* And ſayes *its contrary to the teaching of Chriſt, that noe man can ſerve two Maſters.* Theſe are fit Judges of our dutie to God, or man, and fit reformers of Church, and ſtate, that will have the ſervice of a Maſter, or obedience to a father the ſerving of anothor Maſter, then God, and the ſpirit of God ſpeaking by St. Peter, feare God, and honour the King muſt contradict the teaching of Chriſt, ſuch Church makers doe we now live with. Such, as ſerved heathen Maſters, may not leave their ſervice, though they ſerve not their heathen Gods at their Commaund, and if they did deſert their earthly Maſters for that reaſon, they did not ſerve their Maſter in heaven, who will be ſerved by their ſubjection to their earthly Maſters, but he, that will ſerve himſelfe cannot ſerve God, and that ſelfe ſervice is the whole worke of theſe Rebells, who pretend to put God in the firſt place, that they may leave him noe place, and ſuch, as deſert their King vpon pretence of Gods ſervice, deſert God to ſerve themſelves, and they will only enjoy their power, and wealth, and eaſe for Gods ſake, but ſuffer for him they will not, that kinde of teſtimony to the truth of Religion, they accoun among the corruptions of the firſt ages of the Church, and they have found a more accurate, and pleaſant way to ſerve God.

Intitled

MEDITATIONS VPON DEATH.

BEcauſe the King affordes time to inveigh bitterly againſt that murder, but in the Libellers language *Iuſtice done on him, it will be* as he ſayes *needefull to ſay ſomething in defence of thoſe proceedings.* Doubtles all, that witt, or impudence can offer in defence of that Barbariſme is farr ſhort of a colourable excuſe. He is courting of apocripha, and makes a Prologue out of Eſdras, and Joſephus, *Authors* in his judgment, *not leſſe beleived, then any vnder ſacred,* & brings forth the ſtory of the three wiſe queſtions, and zorobabells determination for women, and truth. Quorſum hæc? *Though he be not aſked, nor in a nation, that gives ſuch rewards to wiſedome.* (his Maſters have not that bountie to reſtore the King, that he may *ſitt next him*, their gratitude being of the ſame Stampe with their loyaltie) he *ſhall pronounce his ſentence ſomewhat different, that eyther truth, and Iuſtice are all one, or els that Iuſtice by his office is to put forth more ſtrength in the affaires of mankinde.* To what purpoſe doth he ſoe ſolemnely produce this peice of Apocripha, and pronounce his ſentence different? Iuſtice is a vertue of the minde, and putts forth noe more ſtrength in the affaires of mankinde then truth, but he talkes of juſtice, and truth, as if they were members of the houſe of Commons. The ſenſuall appetite of ſome is too ſtrong for their vnderſtanding, and thence proceeded the concluſions for the ſtrength of wine, and women. In others the vnderſtanding and reaſon are ſtronger, and there truth is ſtrongeſt, but we may be aſſured, that in this Libeller, and his Maſters, ambition, crueltie, and falſhood are ſtrongeſt, and thence their Actions are an oppreſſion, and defiance of truth, and Iuſtice, and they are growne ſoe abſurd, as from the Titles of ſtrength given to vertues, and paſſions, this triflinge Libeller would haue them non reſident, and to act without a ſubject. If Zorobabell had made truth a fantaſtical perſon, as this man ſtrives to have juſtice vnderſtood, he had ſurely loſt his reward, aswell, as the opinion of his wiſedome. This man would have Iuſtice vnderſtood, as ſhee is painted in a peice of Tapiſtry.

Iuſtice had a ſword putt into her hand to vſe againſt all violence, & oppreſſion in the earth. By whome was this ſword putt into her hand? Doe their

theis Traytours beleive, that their magnifying of Iuſtice makes any man looke on their Barbarous Actions with leſſe deteſtation, or that juſtice is any part of their end, or Actions? Juſtice teaches Rulers how to vſe the ſword put into their hands, but is armeleſſe againſt any violence, and oppreſſion without the power of the Ruler. If the Magiſtrate doe injuſtice, there is noe juſtice committed to others againſt him. The wiſe man by the ſpirit of God tells vs, that he beheld wrong, and injuſtice, and the cryes of the oppreſſed, and there was noe deliverer, and where then was the Libellers juſtice? was not violence there ſtronger then juſtice? Though divine juſtice cannot be avoyded, humane juſtice often fayles, and cannot reach the offender.

Shee is moſt truly, who accepts no perſon, and exempts none from the ſeveritie of her ſtroake. Though by the Rules of juſtice, there is no accepting nor exempting of perſons, yet the Magiſtrate, to whome alone the Rule belongs is confined to perſons, and places, juſtice forbidding all vſurpation, and ſtriking is oppreſſion, where lawfull power gives not the ſword.

Shee never ſuffers injury to prevayle, but when falſhood firſt prevailes over truth, and that is a kinde of juſtice done on them, who are ſoe deluded. And is not falſhood an injury? why ſhould juſtice ſuffer falſhood to prevayle more then other injuries, and why ſhould deluded, and deceived perſons be deprived of Juſtice. And is it Juſtice to ſuffer deceived perſons to be injured? This man ſees the horrid Injuſtices acted by his Maſters, and that muſt be a kinde of juſtice, becauſe (in his ſenſe) vpon deceived men.

Though wicked Kings, and Tyrants counterfeite the ſword, yet ſhee communicates not her power to any, but ſuch, as are juſt, or at leaſt will doe Iuſtice. Doth juſtice communicate her power to every juſt man, or that will doe juſtice, and are they not Tyrants, that take the ſword, which is not given them by the Libellers owne judgment. He would needes make juſtice a Goddeſſe, and Poeticall fancies, realities, and Bellona muſt leade an Army without a Generall. Kings have their power from God, and God gives the ſword ye even to wicked Kings, and becauſe the power is given them for juſtice, it is called the ſword of juſtice, though they vſe it oft-times to Injuſtice, and though there are ſoe many inſtances of wicked Rulers, who yet had their power from God, yet this impudent Blaſpheamour ſayes. *It were extreame partialitie, & Injuſtice, the flat denyal, & overthrow of her ſelfe to put her owne Authenticke ſword into the hand of an vnjuſt, and wicked man, or ſoe farr to accept, and exalt one mortall perſon above his equalls, that he alone ſhall have the puniſhment of all other men tranſgreſſinge, & not receive like puniſhment from men, when he himſelfe ſhalbe found the higheſt Tranſgreſſour.* He beleives not the Scripture tellinge vs Gods advancement of diverſe Kings above their equalls, & to that condition of impunitie; And muſt it not neceſſarily follow from his principles,

that God is vnjuſt, and partiall in ſoe doinge? And if all men be not puniſht equally in this life for the ſame offences? Can there be a greater Blaſpheamy? Were it not the height of Injuſtice, if the governed ſhould judge, and puniſh the Governour? Were it poſſible for mankinde to ſubſiſt in ſuch a ſtate, or can there be a poſſibilitie of any right, or Juſtice in ſuch confuſion? The Scripture forbids vs to judge another mans ſervant, but this man will have the father puniſht by the childe, the Maſter by the ſervant, the Prince by the people.

Iuſtice is, and ought to be ſtrongeſt. The ſtrength of publique Juſtice is the Magiſtrate. Though Juſtice ought to be ſtrong in our affections, and Actions, yet all men are not obliged, nor permitted to doe all Acts of Juſtice. The execution of Civill Juſtice is the Magiſtrates office, it is the ſtrength of Injuſtice to vſurpe the calling of others. From this Lunaticke diſcourſe of the ſtrength of Juſtice, he concludes. *That if by ſentence thus written, it were my happines to ſet free the mindes of Engliſhmen from longing to returne poorely vnder that Captivitie of Kings, from which the ſtrength, and ſupreame ſword of Iuſtice hath delivered them, I ſhall have done a worke, not much inferiour to that of Zorobabell.* The ſentence of this braine ſicke Libeller is very weake to worke on any opinion, but the hath ſet free ſome Engliſhmen from the Captivitie of a received errour, for they were made beleive they fought for their King, and this man tells them it was to ſhake of Kings, and ſurely his vainities, and deceites, and his Maſters Tyrany will perſwade the Engliſhmen to ſeeke their returne vnder the free, and glorious Government of Kings from the Captivitie of theis Tyrants, & vſurpers, that have enſlaved them; And that horrid murder of the King vnder the ſhameleſſe pretence of juſtice, muſt neceſſarily worke deteſtation of the fact, and a longing to be delivered from the Dominion of ſuch Monſters. Noe doubt this Libeller would thinke it an happines to be ſecure in his ſtolen power, but he muſt expreſſe more reaſon, and leſſe impietie to effect ſuch a worke, & he may be aſſured, that as long, as there are men ſoe ingenuous to acknowledge Juſtice, that they muſt deteſt his cauſe, and him. And though Kings be *vnaccountable* to men for their Actions, it is noe way *contrary to the wiſedome of Zorobabell*, who names not Juſtice, and if he had given that ſtrength to Juſtice, which he did to truth, it had been in the ſame ſenſe, vnderſtanding the force of Juſtice, as of other vertues. The ſtrength of the King is over the perſons, that of truth, and Juſtice over the minde. But if the King be accountable to men, are not they, to whome he is accountable by the libellers Argument not only ſtronger then the King, but ſtronger then Juſtice? And ſoe Juſtice is not ſtrongeſt, vnles the ſword be putt into a madd mans hand, and the giddy multitude, from whome nothinge, but Injuſtice can be expected may puniſh their Rulers. To what end were Governments ordained, if juſtice be only in the Governed? Were ever like Tyranies, and Injuſtices

ſuſtices committed by ſingle Rulers, as by the vnbridled multitude, and yet juſtice muſt have noe ſtrength in the mouth of a King, and the word of Rebells only muſt be the ſtrength of juſtice, and this Champion, that bindes juſtice to Rebell power, and excludes it from Kings, hopes to be a Zorobabell to the Engliſhmen for his wiſe ſentence.

That noe law of God, or man gives the ſubjects any power of Iudicature without or againſt the King, he will prove moſt vntrue, and by that *moſt ancient, and vniverſall law, he that ſheddeth mans blood, by man ſhall his blood be ſhedd, and heere* he ſayes *is noe exception of a King*. Though it be plaine, that he, to whome the power of ſhedding the blod of the offender, is committed, muſt neceſſarily be excepted, vnles they will ſuppoſe he muſt kill himſelfe, doth the Libeller imagine, that by this law, all men were judges, or that the ſubject may judge the ſoveraigne, who is not permitted by any law to judge an Equall? As the divine law appointed puniſhments, ſoe likewiſe Rulers, and if people may judge their Rulers, it anulls all the Commaunds of obedience to ſuperiours, all ſubordination in humane ſocietie, and all deciſion of Controverſie, while every one may pretend his owne opinion the Rule of juſtice.

Next he hath found the place in numbers. *Ye ſhall take noe ſatisfaction for the life of a Murderer*. But judges, to whome the law was given, were appointed to declare, who was guiltie of Murder, and we may eaſily ſee, who had beene the Murderers, if every man were to judge a ſuperiour, or the multitude their Rulers, and this the Libeller might have found in the ſame booke where the people charge Moſes, and Aron with killing the people of the Lord, and Moſes ſayes, they were ready to ſtone him. And the Libeller may with his Anabaptiſticall brethren vpon better grounds aboliſh Magiſtracie, then make every man a Magiſtrate, as by this reaſon he would. Though the law appointed noe ſatisfaction for the life of a murderer, yet we finde David pardoned the murder of his ſon Abſolom, and Civill puniſhments are not of immutable law, and it had been murder to take away his life, whome the king had pardoned, and we finde, that though Jacob curſt the rage of his two ſons, yet he put them not to death for the murder of the Sichemites.

A law muſt be founded in vnrighteouſnes, if the people doe not puniſh their Rulers, as the Rulers them. And ſuch a law is contrary to thoſe Rules of righteouſnes God hath preſcribed, and is the deſtruction of mankinde, not any law at tall, and this man feares not to charge God with vnrighteouſnes, that forbidds evill ſpeakinge of their Rulers though wicked, and vnjuſt, and ſcoffes at his ordinance calling *anointinge a Charme*. Can any man of Common reaſon imagine, that a people wilbe obedient vnto any, whome they have power to punish, or that ſubjection can conſiſt with ſuch a condition?

The anointinge of Abiathar to be a Prieſt did not exempt him from the po-

wer of the King. And can any reaſonable man thinke, that any, but the King could have vſed that power vpon Abiathar, or that becauſe the King, who was anointed to that office over the Prieſt, was ſubject to the like from his people, or any private man, as this Atheiſt will have it?

David, as a private man, and in his owne cauſe feared to lift vp his hand againſt the Lords anointed, but this Cannot forbidd the law, nor diſarme Iuſtice from havinge legall power againſt any King. This ſheweth, that divine law forbadd all men to take the Armes of juſtice without, or againſt the King, who is referred to Gods juſtice, and juſtice hath noe Armes, but his power. What David feared, he judged all others had cauſe to feare, *who can touch the Lords anointed, and be innocent?* If David were a private man, being anointed King, who was a publique man? But what David feared, theſe wretches deſpiſe, and Count this forbearance of David a ceremony, which he might have forborne. If David feared in his owne cauſe to lift vp his hand againſt the Lords anointed, the Libeller is his owne judge, and muſt be his tormenter, that makes an impious defence of thoſe, that lifted vp their hand againſt the Lords anointed in their owne cauſe, and were by his owne confeſſion but private men, and he would have their exorbitance, and diſobedience to law vnblameable. Was David a more private man, then they? All ſupreame Counſells in other formes of Government, that have not a Monarch, claime this priviledge of exemptiō from their ſubjects Judicature, bnt thoſe graceleſſe Rebells hold nothinge ſacred, the place of Gods vicegerent they wil have to be an *enormous priviledge*, and blow away Religion, & juſtice like Chaffe with the blaſt of their fancie, though they pretend the ſtrength of it above that of Kings.

He hath done with Scripture, he deſcends now to ſaint Ambroſe excommunicatinge Theodoſius, & he will allow the Biſhopp to be a ſaint for this fact, though his calling were Prelaticall, and vnlawfull in his judgment. But what is ſpirituall excommunication to the puttinge of a King to death? This fact of ſaint Ambroſe is noe Rule. Though Chriſtian Biſhopps refuſed to give the holy miſteries to Princes in caſes of ſins, they did not preſume to make a Civill ſeperation betweene them, and their people, and will the Libeller allow the Biſhopps to be more publique perſons, then Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, and to doe what they would not? He, that makes ſuch outcryes againſt Popery heere takes vp the moſt ſcandalous doctrine, that any of them maintaine, and which the moſt ſober diſclaime, and takes vp thoſe Arguments, which the Jeſuites vſe for the Clergies, and Popes power over Princes, & yet the man would be accounted a zealous Proteſtant. The examples of excommunication by the brittiſh Biſhopps, ſaint Germaine Oudeceus, & the clergy of Morcant might be al true, but nothing to the purpoſe, nor are their excommunications Rules for Chriſtian practice, neither can there be any inference of depoſing, or murderinge Kings from ſuch Actions.

But

But for the *greater Credit* he ſayes *the facts of theis Brittiſh Biſhopps were before we had Communion with the Church of Rome.* And may not he looke on himſelfe, and his crew with horrour for vilyſying, and reproaching the calling of Biſhopps, as Papell, and Antichriſtian, and yet confeſſe it to be before we had any Communion with the Church of Rome?

What power of depoſinge Kings, and conſequently of putting them to death was aſſumed, and practiſed by the Canon law, he ſayes, he omitts, as a thing generally knowne. Why would he not tell, by whome it was practiſed, would that diſcredit the Authoritie? What power the Popes practiſed in depoſinge Kings is generally knowne, and deteſted by all good men being Actions contrary to all lawes, but of their owne making. But did the people of England expect, that all the promiſes of Reformation made by the late Parliament would end only in approvinge the Tyrany, and vſurpation of the Pope over Kings, and juſtifying of the powder plot, and are all the complaints of the Proteſtant Divines againſt the practice of the Popes become impertinent Clamours? But ſuch a defence is ſuteable to the cauſe.

Whole Councells have decreed, that a Counſell is above the Pope, though by them not denyed the vicar of Chriſt, and wee may be aſhamed in our cleerer light not to deſcerne further, that a Parliament is above a King. It were a ſhame to vs, if we ſhould not deſcerne the difference betweene the independent power of Kings, and the vſurped power of the Pope, and this breaker wants ſhame, that pretends cleerer light, and oppoſition to Rome, and yet begg Examples from it. Such, as preferred the authoritie of Counſells above the Pope, had their warrant from the ancient Counſells, which knew not the vicarſhipp of the Pope different from his brethren; And had theſe Counſells thought him Chriſts vicar, and infallible, as the Romaniſts now maintaine, their concluſion of the Counſells ſuperioritie could not conſiſt with their premiſſes, being much alike this Authors ordinary Arguments. But what reſemblance has a Counſell of the whole Church to the Parliament, or Counſell of a particular kingdome? By the lawes of ſome kingdomes there are noe Parliaments at all, and in Counſells they are not ſubjects, but brethren to to the Pope, as they anciently ſtiled themſelves, and they anciently convened, and departed without any leave from him, but in the Engliſh Parliament, they are all ſubjects to the king, and their places were by his inſtitution, and the kings calling any convention for advice, doth not alter the qualitie of ſubjection.

He comes now to humane lawes, and by them he will prove a divine truth. The *judgment given againſt Oreſtes*, either at Athens, whoſe king he was not, or in any other Countrey, where he was but a *Titular*, proves nothing, though the ſtory were Authenticke, and the proceedings legall, but popular furies, though occaſioned by their Governours Crymes are not Examples of imitation. *Solons lawes* belonged not to king-

ly Government, neither were the kings of Sparta Monarchs, nor Licurgus a King indeede, though he had a Title, the constitution of that State being a Republique, and their King noe other, then a Consul of Rome, or a Duke of venice.

The Decree in Rome is farr wide from the matter, and what the *Senate* did against *Nero*, was in vindication of their ancient power, not acknowledging the Justice of his soveraigntie. Though Theodosius decreed the law to be above the Emperour, yet he decreed not any person to have power over the Emperour. The law was above him in reguard it was his Rule, but could not make any person, or societie above him. The law is the directive power to Kings, but subject them not to any, and it is a senseles deduction from the superioritie of the Rule to imagine an inferioritie of the Rulers to the people, or a communitie in power by the Rule.

That *Bracton*, or *Cleta* say *the King is inferiour to the Court of Parliament*, is a manifest vntruth, and Bracton sayes expressely, the King hath not a superiour on earth to punish him, and that only God is the avenger of his Actions, soe farr were theis men from affirminge, that *he stands as liable to receive Iustice, as the meanest of his subjects*. But this man thinkes, that some of his Readers will beleive, that the name of an Author is sufficient Authoritie, though he speake contrary to what he alleadges.

It is said in an ancient booke, the King ought to be subject to the law by his oath. Though the King be bound to performe the law by his oath, is there any to judge him, when all are his subjects, and derive their power from him, or is he subject to any person? And who can judge another, that is not subject to him? Because Kings bound themselves to doe Justice, therefore did they give other men power over them?

That the king permitted questions of his right to *ordinary Iudicature* is an vse of Counsell, not subjection, all Courts being his Counsells, for decision of controversies, but its a sorry inference, that Counsellours in his affaires should have power over his person. As the Parliaments right is circumscribed by lawes in regarde of the subject, soe it cannot be imagined absolute over the king. By what the Libeller hath said, he might well conclude, that kings are oblidged to doe justice, but that the people, or particular persons may judge their king by any law divine, or humane, he hath not offred a colour, soe barren is he in an Argument, which he calls *over copious*.

Who should better vnderstand their owne lawes, and when they are transgressed, then they, who are governed by them, and whose consent at first made them. Certenly he might very wel have answeared himselfe, that they, which governed by such lawes, and whose consent at first made them better vnderstand them, and when they are transgressed, then they, that are governed, and it is a course very agreable to these mens confusion, that the suiter should teach the judge.

The

The Libeller aſkes, *who have more right to take knowledge of things done within a free nation, then they within themſelves.* And ſurely they will not be free long from deſtroying one another, where thats the libertie, for there wilbe as many Tranſgreſſours, and as many lawes, as there are opinions.

He goes about to anſweare the taking the oath of *Alleagiance, and ſupreamacy.* And to this his anſweare is very ready, that *theſe oaths were to his perſon inveſted with his Authoritie, and his Authoritie was by the people given him conditionally vnder law, and oath.* And if his Authoritie had been conditionall, their oaths could not be abſolute, as they are. This guift, and condition they imagine were engraven in Seths Pillars, and they have been long enquiringe for a Cabballiſticke Rabbyn to finde out the Characters. How the kings hereditary ſucceſſion is become a conditionall guift, muſt have better evidence then Aphoriſmes of confuſion, never law contained either the guift, or condition, nor was there ever ſuch impudence before theis Traytours, that avowed, becauſe they ſwore faith to their kings perſon inveſted with his Authoritie, they might take away his Authoritie, and not breake their oath, And it were a prophane oath, aſwell, as vaine, that ſhould be voyde at the will of the taker. The kings oath added nothing to his right, being only an obligation of his conſcience, noe condition annexed to his right, and if he never tooke the oath, his ſubjects obedience is noe whit diminiſhed, and a king by inheritance needes not *admittance*, the death of his predeceſſour puts him in poſſeſſion, & this is the knowne law of England. *The Couquerour* tooke on oath at his Crowninge, and other times, that made noe condition to his Government. There is not only reaſon, but abſolute neceſſitie for the avoyding of confuſion, & ruine of mankinde, that the ſubject be bound to the king, though the kinge faile in his dutie, for the deſtruction of Government is more ſinfull, and inconvenient to humane ſocietie, then any evill, that can come by a kings miſgovernment.

He proceedes to anſweare objections touchinge the Covenant, wherein we ſhall not much inſiſt, but to detect the ſhifts of Malefactours to elude the evidence of truth. They were *accuſed by the King, and his partie to pretend libertie, and reformation, but to have noe other end, then to make themſelves greate, and to deſtroy his perſon, and Authoritie, for which reaſon* ſayes the Libeller, *they added the third Article to preſerve the Kings perſon, and Authoritie in defence of Religion, priviledge of Parliament, and liberties of the Kingdome.* And to ſhew with what ingenuitie he dealt, in ſeeking to avoyde that juſt accuſation, the Libeller tells vs, that they added that cauſe for a ſhew only, and they intended not to preſerve the Kings perſon further, then it might conſiſt with their opinions touchinge Reformation, extirpatinge of Prelacy, preſervinge liberties of Parliament, and Kingdome, and in this very clauſe they called *the world*

to be wittnes with their conſciences of their loyaltie, and yet made *the preſervation of their Kings perſon, and Authoritie*, arbitrary by their owne opinions, and while this Libeller would have their Rebellion a defenſive warr, he forbeares not to tell the world, that they reſolved the Kings deſtruction to attaine their ends.

The ſixth Article gives aſmuch preſervation, and defence to all, that enter into the league, as to him. And it ſeemes more, for they have dealt with none of them, as with him, and he ſayes, *if the Covenant were made abſolute without reſpect to theſe ſuperiour things, it was an vnlawfull vow, and not to be kept.* It is agreed, that vnlawfull vowes are not to be made, nor kept, but it is an vnlawfull vow to deſtroy the Kinge in order to his ſuppoſed ends, yet they feare not to vow the deſtruction of any, that oppoſe them, though the honour, and innocence of the perſons were without the reach of lawes, and they will exempt neither callings, nor integritie from their lawles Injuſtice, and that appeared by his gloſſe vpon the fourth Article of the Covenant *to bring perſons offending to tryall, and condigne puniſhment, all that ſhould be found guiltie of ſuch Crymes, and delinquencies, whereof the King by his letters, and proofes afterward was found guiltie in what they thought him at the taking of the Covenant, to be over ruled only by evill Counſellours.* And had not he avowed all, that ever his letters conteyned in his former declarations, and hath the Libeller forgotten, that the imputation of Crymes to evill Counſellours was but a Ceremony, and are not his foregoinge words, that their ends, reformation, and extirpatinge Prelacy were to be preferred before the preſervation of the Kings perſonand authoritie. This laſt age hath produced a generation, that pretend they doe God ſervice, when they ſcorne all his lawes, and Religion, and hold forth their execrable villanies to the world, as gratefull, and *well pleaſinge ſacrifices to God*, and make oſtentations of their perjuries, and Blaſpheamies, as ſervices to him. The nullities, and vſurpation of thoſe Monſter judges, that made themſelves cut-throates of the King, needed not the Kings exceptions to avoyde their illegallitie being ſoe apparent, & what the King did, or ſaid to of them wil remaine to his honour, and the Libellers infamy, that glories in the misfortunes of Princes, ſayinge it was *learnt from his graund-mother.*

Its a ſad fate to haue his Enemies both aceuſers, parties, and Iudges. The Libeller ſayes, *what malefactour might not pleade the like, if his Crymes have made all men his Enemies.* But there were hardly ever ſuch malefactours, vnles, they, who tooke vpon them to judge the Kinge. He, that is an Enemy before judgment, cannot be a judge of the Cryme, and he, that is an Enemy to a Malefactour vncondemned is not fit to condemne him, and ſuch, as are Enemies to Government, and are common deſtroyers cannot be judges,

That they of *the powder plot might have pleaded the ſame*, when their judges knew not their perſons, nor their guilt till tryall, and conviction

is

is a ſuppoſition like himſelfe, but the powder plot is outdone by theis miſcreants, that have deſtroyed king, and Parliament, and that, which the powder plotters were aſhamed to owne, theſe villaines recount to their honour, like theſe Giants repreſented by Poetts, that made warr againſt heaven, and thence this Libeller dares ſcoffe at the accuſation of their Injuſtice with this lewde Blaſphemy, that *at the reſurrection, it may be aſwell pleaded, that the ſaints, when they ſhall judge the world are both Enemies, judges, parties, and accuſers*. Such are the thoughts of thoſe wicked Atheiſts touching God, and his ſaints, and it is not at all ſtrange, that ſuch prophane perſons exerciſe their curſed ſpeaking againſt Kings, and all in Authoritie, that ſpare not God himſelfe, and it is a ſmall thing with them to vilifie thoſe, whome God hath anointed, & becauſe God by his Prophetts complained againſt the evills of ſome Kings, theſe men take on them to deſtroy all by that Authoritie, and ſay *the earth hath long groaned vnder burdens of their diſorder, Injuſtice, and irreligion*. God gives Teſtimonies to Kings in Scripture, that they were his Servants, that he would by them reſtore, and preſerve his Church, declared it the greateſt earthly favour to ſett ſuch, as he loved on the kingly Throne, beſtowed his owne Titles on them, and yet this Libeller referrs his readers to Scripture for proofe of Rebellion againſt kings, and would perſwade the reformed Churches, he is their Advocate in ſaying. *To binde their Kings in Chaines, and their nobles in linkes of Iron is an honour belonging to the ſaints*. Such blaſphemous expoſiters of Scripture are theſe Reformers. God gave that honour to the Iſraelites to binde the kings of the Amorites, their Enemies in Chaines, and their nobles in linkes of Iron. Theis darlings of the Devill wilbe the only ſaints, & make it their honour to deſtroy the powers, that God hath ordeyned and there muſt be neither kings, nor Nobles, but theis evill ſpiritts, whome noe Irons, nor Chaines will reſtraine, and perjury, robbery, murder, and Rebellion are the honour of theiſe ſaints.

The building of Babell was not *Nimrods worke*, (whome by aſſerted vntruth he calls the firſt king) that worke was a popular vndertakinge, becauſe the people would erect a Republique of confuſion, & not truſt God to protect them, and the Libeller could not have fallen vpon an inſtance more like his preſent madnes, for as thoſe builders faind confuſion in pretending to prevent it, ſoe there Rebells pretend to preſerve the Kingdome by turninge it into popular confuſion, and therefore thoſe ſaints muſt deſtroy Babell, eſpecially *that ſpirituall Babell, and firſt overcome thoſe Europeand Kings, which receive their power not from God, but from the Beaſt*. Doth he meane the Beaſt with many heads? It is his principall Argument, that Kings receive their power from the people, and if ſoe, then are they this beaſt. What Kings of Europe receive their Kingdomes from his Beaſt? But there Sectaries are drunken with their owne prophanes, & pride, and have a ſtrong deluſion to beleive the lies of their owne invention.

Those Kings are counted noe better, then his ten hornes. Noe better, but by what proofe, are they the same by such frenetique dreames, as he produces? *They shall hate the whore*, and yet *the saints must destroy them*, and *shall burne her with fire*, and yet *be overcome first themselves. But they shall at last joyne their Armyes with the Beast after they have destroyed the whore.* And this is the Babilonish Creede, a bundle of contradictions to carry their Giddy followers into attempts as wicked, as their conceites are irrationall. We see the grounds of their cause, an hellish impulsion against Government, and hatred of Kings, there having not been imposters of equall impudence since Mahomett, that professe a Religion to destroy all Kings, and those Blasphemies, that were abhorred in former Sectaries, and Entheusiasts are the Creed of those miscreants.

Tis true, there be a sort of moody, hott brain'd, and allwayes vnedified consciences apt to engage their leaders past retirement, and then vpon a sudden qualme, and Swimminge of their conscience to betray them basely in the middest of what was cheifely vndertaken for their sakes. Seducers cannot thinke to be vndiscovered forever, but such, as are not resolute villaines have a moody conscience in this mans judgment, the tender conscience is become moody, and hott brain'd, and certenly such were many in this Rebellion, or it could never have proceeded soe farr. *Let such men never meete with any faithfull Parliament to hazard for them.* And let never Parliament thinke to be better rewarded, that follow a faction to betray their King, then to be subject to those base multitudes, whome they suborned to attempts against their loyaltie, and become slaves.

He findes *others, in whose consciences gaine hath sprung a sudden leake, and these are they, that cry out of the Covenant broken.* Thus the builders of Babell are scattered, while they make conscience, and Religion their propertie, and in the meane time, nothing is more the subject of their scorne. And if *God were mocked in pretending the Covenant in Scotland, and Vlster*, he was much more in England by crying out the King, Religion, lawes, and libertie, and the Libeller might have found such men, whose prosperitie was sinne, that Triumpht in the afflictions of him, whome they persecuted, and said tush God hath forsaken him, let vs smite him, that he rise noe more. The *sinne of Ahas*, that transgressed more in the tyme of his affliction hath noe resemblance to a vertuous Prince afflicted by Traytours, whose crueltie encreased, while they oppressed him, and exceeded the inhumanitie of the cursed Moabites, that burnt the bones of the King of Edom into lime.

The Kings Charatie in *forgivinge his Enemies*, will finde a right construction with all true Christians, but malice, and detraction of all Acts of pittie cannot meete, with lesse, then detestation in all men any way quallified with Religion, or reason.

Hipocrites Almes, are not more odious, then hipocrites censures, the crueltie of Hipocrites will receive a greater condemnation, then their Almes.

Prayers

Prayers for Gods Compaſſion, are not to *ſhare victory with Gods Compaſſion*. But ſuch, as ſtrive to ſlander mens prayers to God are as malicious to Gods victory, as the devotions of thoſe, that pray vnto him. Such as reade this impudent Libell may rightly call it the Rebells Image, conteyninge precepts, and poſitions of violence againſt Government, confuſion of States, doctrines of falſhood, and hipocriſie, prayſes of inſolence, and crueltie, prophaninge of Gods name, and word, ſcoffes at things ſacred, diſſolution of all bonds morall, Civill, and Religious, of all orders, and degrees among men. And it muſt be hatred to God, and a Diabolicall impulſion, that drives on ſuch perſons to fill vp the meaſure of their wickednes.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 25. Line 6. Reade not after needed. Pag. 25. L. 27. Solleciſme for Solleſiſme. Pag. 25. L. 30. that for then. Pag. 31. L. 19. for inſteede of from. Pag. 33. L. 10. in before their. Pag. 34. L. 1. Baſilice for Aclaſtos. Pag. 40. L. 11. from after lawful. Pag. 44. L. 12. Conventions for contentions. Pag. 58. L. 3. ſupercilious for ſuperſilious. Pag. 63. L. 8. vſes be before vſed. Pag. 67. L. 25. notions for motions. Pag. 67. L. 26. adminiſtred for adminiſtrated. Pag. 69. L. 43. by for the. Pag. 72. L. 30. is for in. Pag. 81. L. 17. and 19. Pſalmiſtry for Pſalmaſtry. Pag. 83. L. 23. is for in. Pag. 84. L. 25. Iingle for Inigly. Pag. 87. L. 25. it is for is it. Pag. 88. L. 18. few for fer. Pag. 90. L. 8. aſperſion of the before moſt. Pag. 91. L. 2. occaſion for reaſon. Pag. 94. L. 9. connaturall for vnnaturall. Pag. 94. L. 13. refrained for reſtrained. Pag. 94. L. 20. vigour for rigour. Pag. 95. L. 43. Cheates for States. Pag. 111. L. 21. like for the. Pag. 111. L. 22. vapours for raignes. Pag. 123. L. 9. prevent for preſent. Pag. 137. L. 19. he for wee. Pag. 147. L. 31. cauſe before had. Pag. 149. L. 35. Stafford for Strafford. Pag. 150. L. 15. noe before part. Pag. 153. L. 11. we for he. Pag. 156. L. 37. ſcreeching for ſtreching. Pag. 156. L. 37. Batts for Catts. Pag. 156. L. 39. we for who. Pag. 159. L. 12. poſſeſſion for oppreſſion. Pag. 160. L. 10. not before ſtrange. Pag. 164. L. 5. place for peace. Pag. 172. L. 38. long for ſtrong. Pag. 173. L. 38. if for is. Pag. 179. L. 25. peace for place. Pag. 182. L. 2. principij for principy. Pag. 184. L. 36. Saviour for Saviours. Pag. 184. L. 37. noe for one. Pag. 185. L. 25. date for dale. Pag. 186. L. 8. inceſtuous. Pag. 194. L. 38. while they for whether. Pag. 197. L. 36. a junto. Pag. 208. L. 28. miſeries for miſteries. Pag. 208. L. 30. now for not. Pag. 213. L. 26. quilting for queſting. Pag. 214. L. 9. infirme for aſſured. Pag. 220. L. 28. preach for reproach. Pag. 220. L. 44. ſubordination for ſubordinate. Pag. 221. L. 24. after poiſoned reade Silveſter & the whole Church. Pag. 224. L. 19. dele him. Pag. 228. L. 32. crum for crim. Pag. 229. L. 34. convictions for convertions. Pag. 230. L. 15. is for a Kinge, inſteed of, by Parliament. Pag. 236. L. 14. expect for except. Pag. 262. L. 15. Fleta for Cleta.